NAGARATNAMĀLIKĀ AND OTHER WORKS OF ŚĀSTṚŚARMAN A STUDY

THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE ***MAHATMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY, KOTTAYAM,***
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

P.I. MARY

Research Centre

GOVT. SANSKRIT COLLEGE, TRIPUNITHURA

SEPTEMBER 2003

DR. T. ARYADEVI
Supervising Teacher
Reader, Faculty of Indian Logic,
Sree Sankaracarya University of Sanskrit,
Kalady

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that this thesis 'NACARATNAMĀLIKĀ AND OTHER WORKS OF ŚĀSTṚŚARMAN A STUDY' submitted for the award of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Sanskrit in the faculty of Language and Literature of Mahatma Gandhi University, Kottayam is a record of bonafide research carried out by Mrs. P.I. MARY, under my supervision.

Tripunithura
2 - 9 -2003

T. Aryadevi
Dr. T. Aryadevi

DECLARATION

I, P.I. MARY, hereby declare that this thesis has not previously formed the basis for the award of any degree, diploma, associateship, fellowship or other similar title or recognition.

P.I. Mary

Tripunithura
2-9-2003

P.I. MARY
Research Scholar
Govt. Sanskrit College
Tripunithura

CONTENTS

CHAPTER IV

CONTENT OF NACARATNAMĀLIKĀ 131-182

CHAPTER V

NACARATNAMĀLIKĀ - AN ANALYSIS 183-205

Preface

Śāstṛśarman popularly known as 'Panditarājan Mānthiṭṭa Kuñju Nampootiry' (1876-1959 A.D.) is a great scholar and versatile genius of Kerala. He was well versed in Nyāyaśāstra as well as in other branches of Sanskrit learning. By virtue of his high intellectual power and hard work, he was able to win the recognition of being an authority in Nyāya and came to be known as 'Karkaśa Tārkika'. The intellectual excellence shown by Śāstṛ śarman in the 'Śāstra Sadas' held in the royal court at Tripunithura was astonishing whereby he was honoured with prestigious titles like 'Tārkikatilaka' and 'Panditarāja'.

Śāstṛśarman is the author of many a work in Sanskrit. 'Nacaratnamālikā', 'Nūtanāloka' - a commentary on 'Nacaratnamālikā' and a Tippaṇi and Avatārika for 'Subodhini' of Parikṣit Rāmavarman are his works in Nyāya. 'Gangātaranginī' and Tīkāprasūnāñjali - a commentary on 'Gangātaranginī' are his contributions to Stotra literature. 'Cātakasandeśa' is a Sandeśa kāvya written by Śāstṛśarman.

'Nacaratnamālikā', the 'Magnum opus' of Śāstṛśarman is a typical treatise on Navya Nyāya. It is an exhaustive explanation of the second definition of Vyapti proposed by 'Pragalbhācārya'. This definition is included as one among the fourteen definitions (Caturdaśalakṣaṇi) quoted by Gangeśopādhyāya in his famous work 'Tattvacintāmaṇi'. In the 'Nacaratnamālikā', the explanation of 'Pragalbha lakṣaṇa' is given elaborately accepting the style of higher dissertations in Navya Nyāya, known as 'Kroḍa patra'. The method of approach adopted in the text, is totally different from the earlier commentators. 'Nūtanāloka' a commentary for

'Nacaratnamālikā' is written by the same author and in this work the high intellect of the author spreads to further angles of vision and many indirect topics are also elaborately discussed.

A Ṭippaṇi and Avatārika for 'Subodhini' - a work in Nyāya by Parīkṣit Rāmavarman, are also written by Śāstṛ Śarman. They are specimens for the wholesome knowledge and they establish the respect of Śāstṛ śarman to his preceptors viz Rājarṣi Rāmavarman and Parīkṣit Rāmavarman.

'Gaṅgātaraṅgiṇī' is a valuable contribution of Śāstṛ śarman to the Stotra literature. The references and purāṇic stories alluded in the verses are clearly described in 'Ṭīkāprasūnāñjali' - a commentary on 'Gaṅgātaraṅgiṇī' written by the same author. The study of these works are capable to induce devotion to Gaṅgā and Gaṅgādhara in the mind of the readers. 'Cātakasandeśa' is a message poem written by Śāstṛ śarman. Although this poem is, to a great extent, an imitation of the Meghadūta of Kālidāsa, it is quite significant in as much as it gives valuable information regarding the important scholars and kings of the that period and also of the important places and temples located between Trissur and Harippat.

All these works of Śāstṛ śarman are significant contributions to the treasure of Sanskrit learning. However no serious effort has been made to study these works in their diverse aspect and estimate their importance in literature. Even 'Nacaratnamālikā', a scholarly work on Nyāya śastra, is not familiar to the modern scholars in the field of Nyāya. The present thesis entitled 'Nacaratnamālikā and other works of Śāstṛ śarman - a study', is a humble effort to serve the above purpose.

The present thesis consists of seven chapters. The first chapter gives

a brief report of the Nyāya tradition of Kerala especially of Tripunithura. Since the work 'Nacaratnamālikā' deals with the definition of Vyāpti, the importance of anumāna pramāṇa and vyāpti is described in the second chapter with a view to furnishing the source and origin of ideas explained in 'Nacaratnamālikā'. The third chapter deals with the characteristic features of 'Nacaratnamālikā' and a brief report of the 'kroḍapatra-s' and Navya Nyāya is included in this chapter. The fourth chapter gives the content of 'Nacaratnamālikā' and fifth chapter is an analysis of the text. The sixth chapter is devoted to present a report of the other woks of Śāstṛ Śarman viz. Gangātaranginī, Cātakasandeśa, Nūtanāloka, Ṭīkāprasūnānjali, and Avatārika and Ṭippaṇi for Subodhini. Last chapter gives the conclusion arrived at as a result of this study.

This research work was undertaken at the instance of Dr. K.G. Paulose my revered teacher. I remember with gratitude the prompt and timely help extented to me by him while he was the principal of the Govt. Sanskrit College Tripunithura. I was fortunate enough to get an opportunity to study in detail the text of 'Nacaratnamālikā' under the able guidance of Dr. V. Ramakrisna Bhatt (Reader in Vedānta, Sree Śankarācārya University of Sanskrit, Kalady) who is a traditional scholar well versed in Vedānta, Nyāya and other systems of Sanskrit learning. My humble 'Praṇāmas' are due to this great perceptor.

I take this opportunity to express my sincere thanks to Dr. T. Aryadevi, (Reader in Nyāya, Sree Śankarācārya University of Sanskrit, Kalady) my supervising teacher for the guidance and encouragement I have received from her. I am highly obliged to Dr. K.S. Meenambal, my revered teacher who was kind enough to go through the last chapter of the thesis and give valuable suggestions in the preparation of this thesis.

Prof. R. Sarojam, Principal of the Govt. Sanskrit College, Tripunithura is my revered teacher in Nyāya. It is her continuous encouragement that enabled me to do this research and my obligation cannot adequately be expressed in words. I wish to express my thanks to Sri. P.C. Vasudevan Elayath (Son of late Prof. P.C. Vasudevan Elayath, a reputed Nyāya scholar) who made available to me the photocopy of Nacaratnamālikā from Vāraṇāsi. I am also thankful to Dr. C.R. Subhadra and other members of the teaching staff of Govt. Sanskrit College Tripunithura for their kind help and valuable suggestions. I am grateful to the office staff and librarian of the Govt. Sanskrit College Tripunithura for their co-operation in my efforts to complete the study. Finally I express my sincere thanks to the authorities of Mahatma Gandhi University for permitting me to do this research work.

Tripunithura ,

2-9-2003

P.I. Mary

P.I. Mary

Abbreviations

CS	-	Cātakasandeśa
GBT	-	Godavarma Bhaṭṭan Tampuran
GT	-	Gangātarangiṇī
HIL	-	A History of Indian Logic
KSC	-	Kerala Sāhitya Caritram
KSSC	-	Keralīya Samskṛta Sāhitya Caritram
NB	-	Nyāyabhāṣya
NRM	-	Nacaratnamālikā
NSM	-	Nyāya Siddhānta Muktāvali
NS	-	Nyāya Sūtra
NUA	-	Nūtanāloka
NV	-	Nyāyavārtika
NVTT	-	Nyāya Vārtika Tātparya Tīkā
PRV	-	Parīkṣit Rāmavarman
RRV	-	Rājarṣi Rāmavarman
SS	-	Śāstṛ Śarman
TC	-	Tattvacintāmaṇi
TCKSL	-	The Contribution of Kerala to Sanskrit Literature
TPA	-	Tīkā Prasūnāñjali

CHAPTER I

THE NYĀYA TRADITION OF KERALA

I. Sanskrit studies in Kerala

The contribution of Kerala to Sanskrit literature is rich and varied. It includes all branches of learning like Kāvya, Nāṭaka, Campu and the technical literature like Vyākaraṇa, Tantra, Mantra, Gaṇita, Śilpa and Vaidya. The study of Pūrvamīmāṁsā and Uttaramīmāṁsā were also prevalent in Kerala. In the field of Sandeśa kāvya and Stotra kāvya, Kerala is having vast bulk of literature.

It is believed that Sanskrit language got entrance to our land with the Brāhmins with their vedic culture. They came from outside in a very early period and Sanskrit existed for many years as the basic language for the spiritual social as well as cultural learning in Kerala[1]. Sanskrit, the treasure house of all kinds of knowledge is treated with great respect, awe wonder and even with devotion by the natives of Kerala. India's treasures like the Vedas, Vedāngas, Itihāsas, Purāṇās, Upaniṣads, Śāstras, Kāvyas and Dramas exist in this Devabhāṣā. Kerala - the southern most part of India also accepted the study of Sanskrit from very olden days.

The Nampootiri Brāhmins of Kerala were held at the top in the spiritual and social hierarchy and were well versed in the arts of war and piece. Due to their special kind of family set up there existed a leisured class who were free from the worries of day to day life and they devoted their entire time to the cultivation of literature and arts. There were many royal families in Kerala and they were also responsible for the rich contribution to Sanskrit literature. The royal courts and the aristocratic Brāhmin families functioned like some sort of universities where learning in all branches of literature were freely dispersed in the traditional way to deserving students. The princes of the royal families had special attention to contribute the education in the traditional subjects.

Many of the temples under the management of the Nampootiris also had facilities for teaching Vedas and Śāstras. The Brahmaswam Maṭhom Trissur was a centre for vedic study. The Kolathiris in the north, the Zamorins of Calicut, the members of Cochin Royal Family in the central part and the Tiruvithamkur kings in the south were some of the rulers who devoted much attention for promoting the study of Sanskrit in Kerala.

It was the general practice that first the Kāvyas, Nāṭakas and preliminary Vyākaraṇa are studied and then the study is extended to

higher level to the technical subjects such as Vyākaraṇa, Jyotiṣa, Mīmāmsā, Smṛti and the Vedāngas. The great Mīmāmsā teacher Prabhākara is claimed by tradition to be a son of Kerala. Śankarācārya (9th C) the great Advaita scholar is an all Indian personality born in the central part of Kerala and his contribution is well known. The name of this great philosopher is enough to highlight that Kerala was a traditional centre for Sanskrit learning.

Dr. Kunjunni Rāja, a recent Sanskrit scholar remarks that Kerala might have come under the influence of Sanskrit from very early time. It began to be seriously felt in Kerala much earlier than the "Kollam era"[2]. He further says that the Avanti sundarī kathā of Daṇḍin belonging to 7th century A.D. refer to a great Sanskirt scholar from Kerala like Mātṛdatta, the poet who wrote some commentaries and his father Bhavarāṭa who commented on some Kalpasūtras. So Sanskrit study may be regarded to have begun to develop in Kerala about 7th century A.D. and from about the 8th and 9th centuries there have been a continuous and luxuriant growth in all branches of Sanskrit literature. The Sanskrit literature is intimately connected with that of the Malayalam literature. Many Sanskrit authors have been authors of Malayalam too and much information could be obtained about Sanskrit from Malayalam literature.

Great dramatist Śaktibhadra is considered as a contemporary of Sree Śankarācārya. Kulaśekharas of Mahodayapuram (9th C.), Bilvamangalam (14th C.), Melpattūr Nārāyaṇa bhaṭṭatiry (17th C.), and Rāmapāṇivāda (18th C.) come in the line of scholars in Sanskrit[3]. This line could be lengthened to the 21st century in Kerala.

The rich scholarship in Mantra, Tantra, Jyotiṣa and Vaidya, even now exist only in the manuscripts. The study of these śāstras were so vast but it had a secrecy in transmitting. Yet the manuscripts in our libraries and in many aristocratic families can unfold varied knowledge in this field.

The learning of Sanskrit as said before was undertaken in the traditional way and there existed many traditional centres for every śāstras. Mīmāmsā and Vyākaraṇa, have prominence in the study of śāstras in Kerala. So two centres should be mentioned viz. Payyūr, and Kūṭallūr. These two traditional learning centres are famous for the study of Vyākaraṇa and Mīmāmsā respectively.

Ancient centres of Traditional learning

1. Payyūr

The Payyūr Bhaṭṭa's family had played an important role in the

history of Sanskrit literature especially in the study of Pūrvamīmāmsa. There were many great scholars and poets in that family and their contribution to Mīmāmsā literature and Sanskrit poetry is immense both in volume and in depth.

The family of the Payyūr Bhaṭṭas is situated near Porkalam about sixteen miles away to the northwest of Trissur. Their village is called Velangad and there exists a temple of that name even today. The deity of the temple is Goddess Gopālika[4]. Dr. Kunjunni Rāja remarks that the earliest member of the Payyūr Bhaṭṭas family about whom we have some literary reference is Ṛṣi I. He has a brother named Bhāvadāsa who was a great scholar in vedānta. Ṛṣi I married Gaurī and got a son named Parameśwara I. This Parameśwara has written many works. He was a great scholar, critic and poet. The following works of Parameśwara I are known

1. Sumanoramaṇi, a commentary of Kālidāsa's Meghadūta.
2. Juṣadhwamkaraṇi and Svaditamkaraṇi on the Nyāyakaṇika of Vācaspatimisra.
3. Haricarita a short poem.
4. Nyāyasamuccaya a work on Mīmāmsā.

In the Malayalam work called Uṇṇunilisandeśa belonging to the 14th century A.D. there is a reference to the poetry of Payyūr Bhaṭṭa[5]. Both Uddaṇḍa Śāstry and Kākkaśśeri Dāmodara Bhaṭṭa who were patronised by Mānavikrama,the zamorin of Calicut of 15th century A.D. have also praised the great scholar of the Payyūr family. Uddaṇḍa Śāstry actually mentions one Maharṣi and his son Parameśwara of that ancient family as great authorities of Mīmāmsā and literature.

There are about six generations of scholars in the Payyūr Bhaṭṭa family from about the fourteenth century. The Parameśwara I had five sons. Ṛṣi II, Bhāvadāsa II, Vāsudeva I, Subhramaṇya and Śankara[6]. Of these the eldest Ṛṣi II married Gopālika and had a son Parameśwara II. This Parameśwara II was a great scholar in Mīmāmsā and has several important works in his credit. Parameśwara II has written commentaries on some of the standard works on Pūrvamīmāmsā. The commentaries are 1. Gopālikā commentary on the Spoṭasiddhi 2. Tattvavibhāvanā commentary on the Tattvabindu of Vācaspatimiśra 3. Another commentary on Cidānanda's Nītitattvāvibhāvanā and a commentary on Maṇḍana miśra's Vibhramaviveka. All these four great works are referred to by Parameśwara II's grandson Parameśwara III in his Jaiminīya sūtrārthasangraha[7]. Parameśwara's commentaries are not only

supplementary to the text but are also helpful in understanding the difficult language of the original text. He explains the misleading parts of the texts and sometimes shows how to dissolve difficult compounds. In the Tattvavibhāvanā he gives a succinct summary of the discussion in verse at the end of each section. Parameśwara II had a brother named Vāsudeva II who was not only a good scholar but also a well known poet. Vāsudeva has many scholarly poems in his credit viz. Devīcarita, Achyuta līla, Satyatapa kathā and Śivodaya. The Devīcarita is a yamaka poem describing the story of Goddess Gopālikā. The Achyuta līla is also a yamaka poem dealing with the Bhāgavata. The Satyatapa katha deals with the story of Satyatapas also called as Maharṣi, an ancestor of the author. It describes the penance of satyatapas at vedaranga and on the bank of Nila.

Parameśwara II had a son named Ṛṣi III. He married Ārya and had a son named Parameśwara III. This Parameśwara is the author of the Jaimineeya sūtrārthasaṅgraha. Thus we have seen at least six generations of scholars in the family of Payyūr Bhaṭṭas among them some of them adorned the court of Mānavikrama, the great. There is a verse in praise of Maharṣi which is attributed to Uddaṇḍa Śāstri.

"पय्यूराढ्यमहर्षे कवितामार्गे च कालिदासं त्वाम्
दाने च कल्पवृक्षं सर्वज्ञत्वे च चन्द्रखण्डधरम्॥"

2. Kūṭallūr

Another famous traditional learning centre which is to be mentioned here is Kūṭallur. Kūṭallur Mana - the family of Nampootiri Brāhmins stands formost for the study of Vyākaraṇa. This family is called Samgamālaya in Sanskrit and was situated at Nāgasreṇi generally known as Nareṇi near Pattambi. The Kūṭallur Nampootiris were believed to be the descendents of Mezhathol Agnihotri. They with their scholarship in Sanskrit and Śāstras, and with the proficiency in teaching, contributed much to the Sanskrit literature especially for Vyākaraṇa. Everyone born in Kūṭallūr was a Vaiyyākaraṇa. The study of Vyākaraṇa which undergone by the Gurukula method was praised by the scholars. There is a verse in praise of this Gurukula.

"कौमुदी पिपठिषा यदि ते स्यादब्दपञ्चकमनन्यविचारः ।
संगमालयमहीसुरगेहं गच्छ वत्स सुचिरं शुभमस्तु॥"[8]

This Gurukula was famous not for the study of Kaumudī alone but for higher studies in vyākaraṇa it was the only abode in Kerala. It is believed that the study of vyākaraṇa continued in this Gurukula for fourteen

generations. Even then there are some scholars who are to be mentioned particularly. The most famous among them was Nārāyaṇan Nampootiri the author of Subhadrāharaṇa belonging to 15th century A.D. This Śāstra kāvya containing twenty sargas illustrates the sūtras of Pāṇini. The other scholars of Vyākaraṇa are Kunjuṇṇi Nampootiri and Kunjikkāvu Nampootiri. Vāsudevan Nampootiripad is another well known scholar and Kunjuṇṇi Nampootiripad was his disciple. The son of Kuñju Nampootiripād viz. Kunjuṇṇi Nampootiripad was a famous Mīmāṁsaka and his elder brother Kāvu Nampootiripād was the teacher of Ayyāśastrikal[9], the famous Vaiyākaraṇa who adorned the court of Rājarṣi Rāmavarman - the king of Cochin.

We have reference to Uṇṇi Nampootiripad of the Mana whom Ullūr refers like this- "This Uṇṇi Nampootiripad once said to Rājarṣi, the Abdicated Mahārāja of Cochin that the Vyākaraṇa study in this family is continuing for the last fourteen generations and I feel sorry that the tradition will last after me[10]. So this Uṇṇi Nampootiripād is believed to be the last scholar of that Gurukula. There are many scholars in Vyākaraṇa who got education from that Gurukulam. Mahāmahopādhyāya Killimaṅgalathu Nārāyaṇan Nampootiripād, Vādānamkuriśśi Pichuśāstrikal, Cennamangalam Ayyā Śāstrikal and the Abdicated Mahārāja of Cochin

were the great disciples of Kuṭallūr Nampootiris. The Arthavādaśatakoṭi of Killimangalam Nārāyaṇa Nampootiri is a krodapatra in which two sūtras of Pāṇini are interpreted widely. Cennamaṅgalam Ayyā Śāstrikal wrote an upotghāta for that Śatakoṭi.

Besides this there are many Vyākaraṇa works from Kerala. The Vaiyākaraṇa siddhānta saṅgraha is a Śāstra kāvya written by Eṇṇakkāṭṭu Rājarājavarma Tampurān. It summarised the whole Siddhāntakaumudi in 'anuṣṭup' metre. The Rāmavarma mahārāja carita of Pāccumūsat, Surūparāghava of Elantur Ramaśāstri are other famous Śāstra kāvyas of Kerala. Trikkanṭiyūr Acyuta Piṣāroṭy, the teacher of famous Melpattūr Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa was a scholar in Vyākaraṇa, Vaidya, Alankāra śastra and Jyotiṣa. His famous Vyākaraṇa work is Praveśaka. It includes the whole Sanskrit grammar in five hundred kārikas. Acyuta Piṣāroṭi's disciple Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa is a famous vaiyākaraṇa as well as a poet and philosopher. Beside Nārāyaṇiya the famous kāvya he wrote three works in vyākaraṇa viz. Prakriyāsarvaswa, Dhātukāvya and Apāṇinīya Prāmāṇya sādhana. The works of modern scholars viz. A.R. Rājarajavarma's (1863-1918) Laghupāṇinīya and P.S. Ananda Nārāyaṇa Śāstri's Vākyatatva are also to be remembered in this context. Peruntānam Nārāyaṇan Nampootiri, the teacher in Śeṣācārya mahāpāṭhaśāla upto 1963 wrote a Vyākaraṇa

work called Sugalārthamāla which deals with the meanings of lakāra in 130 ślokas. Sri. D. Damodara Piṣāroti, the Nyāya teacher of the same institution upto 1972 wrote a commentary on this work known as 'Dīpikā'.

II. Tradition of Nyāya Śāstra in Kerala

The study of Vyākaraṇa, Mīmāmsā etc.were prevalent in Kerala, but Nyāya study was not much popular. The Sabhāmaṭhoms did not include Nyāya as a subject for study in their curriculum. Yet there are some references about the scholars of Nyāya. Vadakkamkur Rājarājavarma states that the books relating to Nyāya was not written by Keralites and the study of Nyāya was not popular[11]. But we can see in many places Vadakkamkūr mentions many authors as studied Tarka from somebody. So Tarka was studied by sankṛtists and many had basic knowledge of that sāstra. Kumbhakoṇam Krisnasāstry is told as the student of Vidvān Elaya Tampurān by Vadakkamkur[12]. It is also stated by Vadakkumkūr that Mutukuṛuśśi Bhāskaran Nampootiri was a student of a Maṇi Tampuran of Kozhikode. He was called as Maṇi Tampuran because he was well versed in "Cintāmaṇi" a Nyāya grantha[13].

Moreover the style and methodology of Navya Nyāya can be seen in the works of other śāstras. As the study of sanskrit language

and sāstras flourished under royal patronage, the study of Nyāya also got entrance to the royal courts at a later period. While thinking about these royal courts Kotungallur and Tripunithura are to be remembered first where Nyāya scholars from the neighbouring states were invited and respected by appointing them as the teachers in Nyāya in their Gurukulam and Palace.

1. Contribution of Nyāya scholars from Tamil Nadu to the study of Nyāya

The literary patronage of Kerala chieftans attracted not only scholars and poets from the different parts of Kerala but also from the neighbouring states. Many scholars outside Kerala visited and spent considerable part of their life time in this state. The scholars are fortunate enough to enjoy sufficient encouragement and highly favourable atmosphere. The kings regarded that it is their duty to give patronage to those scholars.

The Nyāya study in Kerala was popularised with these scholars of Kumbhakonam. Kumbhakonam Kṛṣṇa Śāstry and Śatakopācārya were appointed as Nyāya teachers in the Kotungallur Kovilakam. Tripunithura acquired eminence in the study of Nyāya from three reputed scholars

from Tamil Nādu viz Śeṣācārya, Śatakopācārya and Rangappācārya[14]. Śeṣācarya's grandson Setumādhavadeekṣitar, an eminent Nyāya scholar was the friend of Parikṣit Rāma varman and Śāstṛ Śarman.

The famous Nyāya scholars of Kerala viz. Bhaṭṭan Tampuran of Kotungallur, Rājarṣi Ramāvarma and Parīkṣit Rāmavarma from Tripunithura are the disciples of these scholars who came to Kerala seeking patronage. Other Nyāya scholars are also considered as the 'Praśiṣya's of these pandits. The contribution of these scholars should be recognized with gratitude by the lovers of Nyāya as that chain continues in Kerala.

It seems that Navya Nyāya was more appreciated in Kerala than Prācīna Nyāya. The manuals like Tarka Sangraha with Dīpikā, Muktāvalī and Dinakari are studied first within three years. Then the higher works like Pañcalakṣaṇi, Caturdaśalakṣaṇi, Siddhānta lakṣaṇa, Sāmānya nirukti, Avayava, Pakṣatā and Vyutpattivāda are studied within three years. Thus the study of Nyāya śāstra in the formal level lasts within six years. Then the students enrich their scholarship by self study and discussions. The 'śāstra sadas' was a great help for them to think deeply on the subjects and students got opportunities to participate in it along with the teachers.

2. Kotungallur Gurukulam

The Kotungallur Kovilakam was well known as the Takṣaśila of south India in the eighteenth century A.D. It was a centre for the distribution of all kinds of traditional knowledge. The rulers of that family were great scholars and patrons. Depending on them a number of scholars served a lot for the propogation of the study of śāstra, kāvya and sangīta. So it is known as the Kotungallūr Gurukulam[15]. The great scholars like Kavisārvabhauma Koccunni Rāja, Kuncikuttan Tampuran famous as Kerala Vyāsa, Valiyakoccunni Rāja,great scholar in Astronomy were some of the teachers that adorned this Gurukulam. Gȯdavarma Elaya Tampuran, Godavarma Bhaṭṭan Tampuran were the great scholars in Nyāya.

Panditarājan Māntiṭṭa Kunju Nampootiri - the famous Naiyayika, Āttur Krisna Piṣāroṭy - famous as Ubhayakaviśwara are the disciples of the above said scholars who were later become more famous than their teachers.

Vadakkamkur states that in that Gurukula learning and teaching were done on Sādhyāyadinas (days on which teaching is not prohibited) and discussions and other academic activities were done on Anadhyāyadinas (days on which teaching is prohibited)[16]. The 'sāstra -

sadas', kavisammelana in Sanskrit and Malayalam were the chief functions of the Gurukula. The dramas were played and even the kings participated as actors. The women also had opportunities to study śāstras. There were many scholars among the queens of this Kovilakam. All the queens were well studied in the preliminaries of the Śāstras like Nyāya, Vyākaraṇa and Sāhitya. Koccikkāvu rājñī, wife of Māntiṭṭa Kuñju Nampootiri was a famous scholar who was ornated with the title 'Panditarāja' by Parikṣit Rāmavarma. The grandmother of Kerala Vyāsa ie Appūccirajñi was also a scholar in different śāstras[17].

3. Nyāya scholars from Kotungallur Gurukulam

Godavarma Vidvān Yuvarāja (Elaya Raja) and Godavarma Bhaṭṭan Tampuran are the two important Nyāya scholars to be mentioned from this Gurukulam.

Godavarma Vidvān Yuvarāja

Godavarma Vidvān Yuvarāja was an accomplished scholar in various branch of learning like Jyotiṣa, Kāvya, Tarka, Śilpa, Vaidya, Āśauca and was famous as a Naiyāyika by his work 'Hetvabhāsodāharaṇa', Elaya Tampuran was born in 1800 A.D. and his parents were Elankuruśśi Matṛdatta Nampootiri and Viduṣi Kunnikkutty

Tampuratty. His first teacher was Valappil Āsān and studied Vyākaraṇa from Deśamangalam Warrier. Mādhavan Aṭitiri was another teacher. His famous disciples are Kumbhakoṇam Kṛṣṇa Śāstri, a famous teacher and Paccumūsat another scholar and composer of many books[18].

Vadakkamkur mentions about fifteen works of this great scholar viz. Ramacarita, Hetvābhāsa, Sri Pādasaptakam, Sudhānandalahari, Rasasadanam, Golādhyāya etc[19]. Among his works Rāmacarita is the most important one which is a kāvya deals with the incarnation of Sreerama upto the Sītādarśana of Rāvaṇa. It is a narrative one but incomplete. "Hetvābhāsodāharaṇa" is a work which deals with the fallacies of hetu. It gives the ślokas as examples for hetvābhāsās. Hetvabhāsa is an important topic in the Nyāya system which is included in the Anumāna portion. The knowledge of hetvābhāsa prohibits the production of anumiti. There are five kinds of hetvābhāsās viz. 'savyabhicāra', 'viruddha', 'satpratipakṣa', 'asiddha' and 'bādhita'. Vadakkamkur quots three kārikās from that book. Among them the first one is -

"त्वं रुष्टा मयि चेन्नमामि दयिते नेयं त्वया नम्यताम्
नम्यत्वं त्वयि भाति पार्थिवतया मन्ये महारजवत् ।
कुम्भादिष्टतिवर्तनात् त्वदुदितं साधारणं साधनम्
वाग्वादेष्विति निर्जितो दयितया रामसुखं रातु वः"[20].

This kārika is given as an example for 'sādharana savyabhicāra' which is defined as sādhyābhāvavat vṛtti hetu - the hetu exists in the locus where the absence of sādhya occurs. Here sādhāraṇa savyabhicāra can be shown in the inference, Rāmaḥ namyaḥ pārthivatvād (Rama is salutable as he is a king). Pārthiva means a king and king is saluted by all. But this word can also denote the genus of Pritivi (earth - Pārthiva). So in this inference the hetu pārthivatva (earthness) exists in the pot which is made up of earth. But the sādhya 'namyatva' (salutable) is not existing in a pot.

Then next karika

"कृष्ण पुष्णतु सौख्यं सुमुखि सुमुखतां याहि याहि प्रियां तां
मन्यासक्तं कुतो मां कलयसि दयिते केवलं त्वत्स्वभावात् ।
यद्येवं मुग्धता ते करणमिदमसाधारणं पक्षमात्रे
वृत्तित्वादित्यकस्मात् प्रणयकलहितां राधिकां सान्वयन् वः" ॥

It may be an example for asādhāraṇa savyabhicāri which is defined as "Sarvasapakṣa vipakṣa vyāvṛttaḥ pakṣamātravṛtti" - the hetu is with the character of existing only in the pakṣa and not in sapakṣa or vipakṣa. In the śloka the character of the beloved is described as its own that is existing in the pakṣa alone, so it is a fallible reason called 'asādhāraṇa'.

Vadakkamkur mentions that there are many such works in Vyākaraṇa but no other work of this type is found in Tarkaśāstra[21].

Godavarma Bhaṭṭan Tampuran

GBT of Kotungallur Kovilakam was a famous scholar in many śāstras especially in Nyāya śāstra. He was born in 1858 A.D. and his parents were Akkarakkuriśśi Raman Nampootiri and Smt. Kunjikutty Rājñi. It is believed that this Tampuran was so unhealthy in his childhood and was even unable to speak. He gained the ability to speak by the grace of Kotungallur Bhagavathi[22].

GBT's first guru was his own father. He gained the knowledge about ritual practices from his father. His uncle Godavarma and Kunjuṇṇirāja taught him kāvya and jyotiṣa. Rājarṣi Rāmavarma of Cochin Palace taught Vyākaraṇa and Nyāya. But higher works in Nyāya were studied from Kumbhakoṇam Śadakopācārya who was famous as Nyāya Pancānana. GBT gained deep knowledge in Nyāya from him. So Śatakopācārya is considered as his principle teacher. A kārikā in Siddhāntamāla denotes the devotion to that teacher[23]. Vedānta and Dharmaśāstra were studied by his own effort. Even though well versed in all sastras Nyāya was his favourite subject. People approach GBT to

clear their doubts in various subjects. Ullur remarks that even Rājarṣi Rāmavarma, a famous scholar in Nyāya approached Bhaṭṭan Tampuran to clear his doubts in Nyāya[24].

The title 'Bhaṭṭa', the greatest honour was conferred on the scholars who proved either their superior excellence in several śāstras in open contests of scholarship in debates at Sabhā maṭhom, or who proved their super intelligence in composing or interpreting books of high standard[25]. Godavarma, a famous scholar who deserved the title in both ways was awarded with the same by the contemporary shcolars. The Visroy of India awarded him the title Mahāmahopādhyāya in 1911 A.D. as a recognition for his all sided scholarship. Ullūr remarks that after Gaṇapati śāstri the title Mahāmahopādhyaya was given to two scholars and they are Killimangalam Nārāyanan Nampootiripād and Godavarma Bhattan Tampuran[26].

The great disciple of GBT - Śāstṛ Śarman remembers his Guru in the work Cātaka Sandeśa very reverently as a well versed teacher in the śāstras of Vyākaraṇa, Nyāya, Vedānta and Dharma śāstra[27]. Āttur Kṛṣṇa Piṣaroty, a well known Malayalam writer is also his disciple.

Works of Godavarma Bhaṭṭan Tampuran

It is believed that there are about 12 books as that of GBT like Upahāraprakāśikāvyakhyā, Śaktiprakāśika, Bhāgavata Pradhamasloka Vyākhya, Nyāyaratnāvali Vyākhya, Pramanya vāda Vyākhya and Sidhāntamāla. Among these works of Bhaṭṭan Tampuran, some are commentaries on standard works. Some of them are not yet published. The 'Prāmaṇya vāda Vyākhyānā' is a Nyāya work but this is also unpublished. Siddhāntamāla is a 'śāstṛa grantha' written in kārika style which describes briefly the meanings of seven cases according to the Vyutpattivāda of Gadādharabhattācārya. There are various theories about the Śabdabodhā in Indian Philosphy. Gadādharabhaṭṭa proposed his theory of samsarga maryādāvāda in ths text[28].

GBT composed the commentary in the Kārikā form with all the theories proposed by Gadādharabhatta. It includes seven prakaraṇas and 495 kārikas. The first kārika is a managaḷa śḷoka and it includes the concept that śakti is the power of words to denote the meaning and the same is the desire of God[29]. The method followed in this work is simple and very much useful for the beginners to understand and byheart the theories.

III. Nyāya Scholars from Tripunithura

The tradition of Nyāya is popularised in Tripunithura by the eminent Nyāya scholar Śeṣācārya from Kumbhakoṇam. Śeṣācārya taught Nyāya to the Mahārāja of Cochin i.e Rājarṣi Rāma Varman and it was developed by the descendents of that family and by their disciples.

It is believed that the kings of Cochin had their origin from the Perumals of Mahodayapuram. The capital Mahodayapuram was shifted to Cochin in the fourteenth century A.D. Later it came under the rule of British kingdom. Cochin ceased to exist as a separate state consequent to the integration of Cochin and Travancore in 1948. Then it became the central part of Kerala by the formation of states in the basis of languages used by people.

The mention of Nyāya scholars are seen in Kerala from the early time but their erudition was transmitted to their disciples only by oral tradition. The disciples also followed the same method and there existed this traditional scholarship without break. They are happy and satisfied if their disciples had attained the erudition which was given by these 'Guru-s'. So they were not cared much to record their scholarship.

The scholars had chances to show their all round scholarship in

the 'Śāstra Sadas', while doing the 'Vākyārtha varṇana'. The strong arguments proposed by them are enough to highlight their deep knowledge. The winners of 'sadas' were honoured with titles and presents. More over these scholars had wide recognition and patronage from the rulers. That may be one reason for the scholars that they were reluctant to write more. The other reason may be the thought that have occured in their minds that even the vast literature written by the earlier eminent scholars could not be studied completely in this life, then what is the use for writing more. All the members of the Cochin royal family were scholars and patrons of learning and some of them have contributed to other branches of Sanskrit literature also. Among them two kings should be specially mentioned who had devoted their whole life for studying and popularising sanskrit language and especially Nyāya śāstra. They are Rājarṣi Rāmavarman, the Abdicated Mahārāja of Cochin and Parīkṣit Rāmavarman the last ruler of Cochin.

1. Rājarṣi Rāmavarman (1852-1931)

RRV was a scholar king, a patron of learning and an efficient ruler, who adorned the royal palace of Cochin. His reign was considered as the golden age for the study of Sanskrit literature and especially for Nyāya śāstra. RRV was the king who made Cochi as the modern Cochin.

RRV was born in 1852 as the son of Kutalāthpurath Bhāskaran Nampootiripad and Ambālikā Tampuraṭṭy. RRV's first teacher was Kunnuṇṇi Nambi. His Highness studied English from Robert white and Nyāya Śāstra from Śeṣācārya.

Contribution of RRV to the study of Śāstra

The important contribution of RRV to the study of śāstra is the establishment of Samskrta Pāṭhaśāla in the name of his Nyāya teacher Śeṣācārya and there by the king showed his devotion to that Guru. The origin of the present Sanskrit College, Tripunithura, is to be traced to the sāstra classes conducted by the Āsthana Paṇḍitas of Cochin Palace who were specially invited by the Mahārāja and appointed for imparting instruction in the Higher branches of Sanskrit learning in the traditional way[30]. These scholars held regular sāstra classes in some buildings attached to the Palace where students eager to pursue advanced studies in śāstras came and lived as in Gurukula. Facilities for free lodging and boarding were provided. Books and manuscripts of Palace Grantha library were made accessible to them. Scholars like Rangapācārya, Bhīmācārya, Śeṣācārya, Śatakopācarya, Pichu Jyotsyār, Trikkovil Uzzuthara Warrier and Sri Setumādhava Dīkṣitar were some of the well known teachers lived in that period.

RRV the Maharaja of Cochin was a profound scholar in śāstrās particularly in Nyāya and Vyākaraṇa. He had a strong desire for the preservation and advancement of the indegenous system of Sanskrit study in its higher branches, so that the old type of Paṇḍits with their profound knowledge of śāstrās may not altogether die out. So Rājarṣi established the śāstra Mahāpāṭhaśāla which offered advanced instruction in three śāstras viz. Nyāya, Vyākaraṇa and Vedānta. The duration of course of study was seven years; five years for the study of the above subjects and two years for the study of general subjects which would enable the students to appear for the oriental Title Examination of the Madras university. The college was not affiliated to any university, for the founder has the view that the affiliation to the university might not be conducive to the realisation of the purpose for which the college was started. So the college was existed under the control of the Divān.

On the opening day itself Mahārāja appointed prominent teachers in this institution. In the Ravivarma Granthāvalī it is said "on the opening day itself the Pāṭhaśāla had the prevelage of having in its staff two eminent scholars of South India Brahmaśrī Māntiṭṭa Kuñju Nampoothiri and M.B. Śankara Nārāyaṇa Śāstri as lecturers in Nyāya and Vyākaraṇa"[31]. Brahmaśrī P.V. Pancapakeśa Śāstri joined as lecturer in Vedānta and

these three scholars were in full charge of their respective sections as far as teaching work is concerned. It was because of these three gems that the Mahāpāthaśāla reached the zenith of its glory. Later this institution was handed over to the Government of Kerala and known as Government Sanskrit College, Tripunithura. Even then the encouragement given to the study of śāstras was continued and arrangements were made by the kings of that family to continue the 'Śāstra Sadas' and to publish unpublished valuable works.

Śāstra Sadas - an outline

It was at the time of RRV that the 'Śāstra Sadas' at Tripunithura was established as an annual function. Reputed scholars inside and outside of Kerala were invited to that sadas. The scholars assembled and there were interactions among them. It was a common platform for them to discuss the various knotty points of the śāstra. Each scholar will get opportunity to present his opinion in that assembly. King RRV will preside over the function. All the other scholars in that sabhā also will get chance to present ideas either as complimentary or contradictory to the opinions proposed by the previous scholars. Always there will be deep discussions and each one try to explain his points with strong arguments. The sabhā will continue till they reach to a determination

about the discussion. The winners are fotunate enough to get valuable presents, or titles from the Mahārāja.

Eminent scholars like Panditarājan Punnaśśeri Nambi, Kūṭallūr Kunhuṇṇi Nampootiripad, Killimangalam Nārāyanan Nampootiripad, Panditarājan Uzuthara Warrier, Setumādhava Dīkṣitar, Māntiṭṭa Kunju Nampootiri were some of the eminent participants and winners of honour from that sadas. The sabhā of such eminent scholars was very helpful for the participants to enrich their knowledge and to think about a subject deeply with all the connected issues. The rules followed in that Sabhā were that marked in the Nyāya sūtra - the first systematic work of Nyāya sāstra. The subjects of Nyāya śāstra were included as important topics of discussion. Even now the śāstra sadas and publication of books are going on in that institution.

Honours Received

The fame of RRV as a 'scholar king' was recognised all over India and he was the president in the conference of All India Ayurvedic Samiti held at Poona on 1917 A.D. It is noted that after hearing the presidential address Lokamānya Bālagangādhara Tilak remarked "It is known that you are a scholar among kings, but now I know that you are

a king among scholars"[32]. RRV participated in the all India philosophical conference in Trivandrum and talked about the intellectual tradition of India which impressed the members and his erudition was accepted by all. He was so humble to approach other scholars to clear the doubts. It is said that if the doubt is in Vyākaraṇa, he will go to Killimangalam Narayanan Nampootiri and if the doubt is in Nyāya he is ready to clear it with Bhaṭṭan Tampuran[33]. RRV was a recognised scholar and was the ruler of a state but still he lived as an ascetic.

RRV was not interested much to record his scholarship yet we have two books of him. First one is Vedānta Paribhāṣā Saṅgraha which is a resume of the Vedānta principles. Next one is Bālabodhana - a primary text to Vyākaraṇa. It is great help to the beginners to study Sanskrit grammar which deals with the nature of technical forms in Vyākaraṇa Śāstra like Pada, Vākya, Sakarmaka, Akarmaka and Vibhakti.

Rājarṣi abanded his position as the Mahārāja of Cochin in 1914 and so he is well known as the Abdicated Mahārāja of Cochin. Then he led his life in Trissur as ascetic until his sad demise in 1931 A.D.

2. Parīkṣit Rāmavarman

PRV a scholar king, and the last Maharaja of Cochin is accepted

as the author of many works in Nyāya śāstra as well as in another branches of Sanskrit learning. His Nyāya works are Subodhini, Jalavad hṛda niścayatvavicāra and Bhūmika to the work of Śāstṛśarman.

Life and Education

Rāmavarma Kunnunni Tampuran otherwise known as Parīkṣit Tampuran was born in 1876 A.D. as the son of Ottur Raman Nampootiripad - a Rgvedic scholar and Manku Tampuran of Cochin Palace. He started his primary education from his mother and then studied sanskrit from Kuṇṇan Warrier - the teacher in Samskrita Pāṭhaśāla. Kāvyās and rudiments of Nyāya were studied from this Pāṭhaśāla. Higher studies in Nyāya were under his uncle Rājarṣi and Śrī Śatakopācārya, the court Pandit and one of the greatest Nyāya scholars of India. Moden Education was in Maharaja's College Ernakulam and in the Presidency College Madras. Then the prince settled in Tripunithura and studied the sastras like Mīmāmsā, Vedānta and Nyāya.

PRV led a Pure and Chaste life. Most of his time was spent for meditation, worship, reading books and for śāstric discussions with the court paṇḍits of the palace. As the Rāja was brought up in an atmosphere where Sanskrit learning was held in the higher level, and was surrounded

with well known scholars like his uncle Rājarṣi, Śatakopacārya, Māntiṭṭa Kunju Nampootiri, Ayyāśāstrikal and Setumādhava dīkṣitar. It is no wonder that the Rāja had a special attachment to the ancient language, literature and śāstra.

PRV's life was for learning and contributing learning. He dedicated his life for the propogation and advancement of knowledge. Even though His Highness was a highly orthodox follower of the ritualistic practices in his personal life, he is the first ruler who abanded the royal power merely for three copies of Government Calender and paved the way to function a socialist government in the state. Thus PRV stood for the love and wellfare of his people when he knew that democratic rule is more preferable for them.

Honours received

Sri Śankarācārya of Kānci Kāmakoti Maṭhom bestowed the title Darśanakalānidhi on PRV by recognising his authority in Indian Philosophies. The Ācaryas of Kānci Kāmakoṭi awarded the title Abinava Tarkavāgīśa in recognition of his erudition in Nyāya. The Banaras University proposed to give him the degree Vidyāvācaspaty but His Highness declined it owing to poor health. Dr. C. Kunjan rāja - a modern

scholar wrote a beautiful poem about him and Achyuta Potuvāl - a 'Praśiṣya' of Rājarṣi wrote Parīkṣitcarita about his life.

Contribution of P.R.V. to Sanskrit study

The encouragement given by PRV to the study of Sanskrit Śāstra and Sāhitya is very great. The Śāstra Sadaś started by his uncle RRV; got more enthusiasm in his period. PRV presided over the sadas and the scholars were treated as guests. Panditarāja and Sāhitya nipuṇa gold medals were being awarded for deserving scholars.

Works of PRV

PRV was the author of many works which include Commentaries, Stotras and Campus. The Sārārthadeepika is the commentary on Kālidāsa's Abhijñāna Śakuntala. It is a product of the combined work of Parīkṣit and his friend Panditarājan K. Rāmapiṣāroṭy. It gives exhaustive explanation to every word rasa and bhāva. The other commentaries are the Rasikapriyā to the 'Narayaneeya' of Melputtūr Nārayaṇa Bhaṭṭatiri and Bālapriyā commentary to the 'Dhvanyāloka' of Ānandavardhana.

The Stotras written by PRV are praises shown to Pūrṇatrayeeśa which is the family diety of the author. The collection of stotrās is known

as Stotramāla where Viṣṇu and Subrahmaṇya are praised. Gangāstava is another short devotional poem praising the river Gangā. The critical essays written by him in Malayalam is known as 'Dalangal'.

PRV was closely associated with Kerala stage in its performance of Kūttu and Kūtiyāttam. PRV patronised great actors like Cāccu Cākyar, Paimkulam Rāma Cākyār and Māni Mādhava Cākyār. He wrote many Prabhandhas for their performance. The Campu works are Prahlādacarita, Ambarīṣa carita, Sukanyā carita and Rādha Mādhava.

Subodhini and Jalavad hṛda niścayatva vicāra are the works in Nyāyasāstṛa.

Importance of Subodhini

The work Subodhini written by PRV is a monumental work from Kerala to Nyāya śāstra. It is a commentary on Muktāvali and Taraṅgiṇi - the commentaries for the Bhaṣāpariccheda. Bhāṣāpariccheda - a manual of Nyāyavaiśeṣika has many commentaries. The first commentary Muktāvali is written by the author himself. Mahādeva wrote a commentary known as Prakāśa and it was completed by Dinakara, his son. So it is called as 'Dinakari' also. Likewise Rāmarudrī or Taraṅgiṇī is the commentary written by Rāmarudra and it was completed by Rājaśekhara.

Later commentaries are Prabhā by Nṛsimhaśāstṛy and Mañjuṣā by Paṭṭābhirāma śāstry. Subodhini is a commentary which includes all the views of these commentators.

There are two kinds of works in the śāstra viz. Prakaraṇa and Vāda. One can enter the second type only after studying the first type. The modern works are generally cosidered as Prakaraṇa even though there are exceptions. The Taṛkasamgraha, Muktāvali, Vedānta paribhāṣā and Arthasangraha can be included in the former type. The works like Tattvacintāmaṇi, Dīdhiti and Gādādhari are examples for the second type.

The Bhaṣā pariccheda of Viswanātha Pancānana (17th century A.D.) and his commentary on the same were very popular and important among the Prakaraṇās as that of Tattvacintāmaṇi and Dīdhiti among the Vāda works. The Prakaraṇa or manuals of logic is defined as a book which concerns itself with the topics of a portion of a śāstra which may deal even with matters not included in that śāstra[34]. Bhaṣāpariccheda is a vaiśesika work which incorporates the Nyāya category of pramāṇa. The pramāṇa concept of Nyāya is included while discussing the category of dravya.

The commentaries like Prabhā and Mañjuṣā are very vast in certain places but it is silent in some other places. The criticism porposed by these authors against Mahādeva and Dinakara are sometimes out of place, as without understanding the apt meaning. But Mahādeva discusses the topic with enough words (mitākṣara). So it is very much conducive to understand the real meaning intended by the author. Hence Prominence of this work is accepted by the teachers and students. The commentary of it- the Rāmarudrī ends with the Śabdakhaṇḍa.

Subodhini is a commentary for all these commentaries, but always tries to establish the views of Mahādevabhaṭṭa. It is a valuable contribution to Tarkaśāstra in which high thinking and power of interpretation is displayed. It is composed after deep research in other commentaries and old manuscripts along with the scholarship the commentator had obtained from his erudite teachers. Subodhini starts with a salutation to the family deity - 'Pūrṇatrayīśa' and to his teachers. Then he gives the nature of the work[35].

The author of `Prabhā' has attacked the views of `Prakāśa' on several occassions without sufficient justifications. `Mañjuṣā' generally appreciates and approves the line of `Prakāśa'. Yet at times it too has adversily criticised the views of Mahādeva. The author of Subodhini is

partial towards the views of Mahādeva. SS in his Avatārika to 'Subodhini' commends that Tampuran has a tradition which is gathered from Śeṣācārya who is the Praśiṣya of the author of Rāmarudrī. So the appreciation to Prakāśa commentary is natural and the Subodhini can be considered as a "Guru Saparyā"[36] (Offering to the Guru). For instance explaining the sentence beginning from "Lakṣmī Pādayugam", the author of Dinakarī says that this term is referential to father and mother because they are considered as deities on the Upaniṣad Vākya - "Mātṛdevo bhava, Pitṛdevo bhava". So the salutation is done to these deities. Then he gives the views of others with the term 'Kecit'. Their view is that the vigraha of 'Lakṣmīpādayuga' is given as 'Lakṣmī pādayuge yasya tam' (to him, where the laksmy resides in his feet). So the term may be treated as the qualifier of pitā. So the invocation is done by throat to the father[37]. PRV refutes it by saying that - it cannot be approved in a humble word 'Tadasundaram', because there is no laxity in approving the secondary meaning.

Another example can be shown from the first part of Subodhini, while discussing the significance of the word 'Vighāta' (Vighna vighātāya), he says that the words of the Taraṅgiṇī and the abuses put on it by the author of Mañjuṣā should be discussed[38]. The word "Paraiḥ"

denotes - the author of Mañjuṣā.

In another place PRV says that Paṭṭābhirāma elaborately explained the law that "viśiṣṭa vācakānām padanām sati viśeṣaṇa vācaka pada samavadhāne viśeṣya-mātraparatā", but PRV says that the view of Mahādevabhaṭṭa is more reasonable[39].

The author had given vivid explanations where the subject matter dealt in the earlier works remained abruse. So new light has been shown and new ideas have been incorporated in this book by PRV

Jalavad hṛda niścayatva vicāra

The other Nyāya work of PRV is 'Jalavad hṛda niścayatva vicāra'. It is a small work dealing with a special topic in the hetvābhāsa prakaraṇa. In the Tattvacintāmaṇi of Gangeśa there is a Prakaraṇa called Sāmānya nirukti prakaraṇa which deals with the 'hetvābhāsas' (fallacies of hetu). According to Nyāya concept - anumāna is the second means of knowledge which produces the inferential knowledge (anumiti) and it is defined as Parāmarśajanyam jñānam. Parāmarśa is 'vyaptiviśiṭapakṣadharmatā-jñānam'. So vyāpti and pakṣadharmatā are the components of this type of knowledge. Vyāpti is the special feature of 'Sadhetu'. Hetu can be of two types, 'sadhetu' - possessing vyāpti and pakṣadharmatā and 'asadhetu'

which is lacking such features. The asadhetu is also called as hetvābhāsa or duṣṭa hetu and it is divided into five kinds ie 'Savyabhicāra, viruddha, satpratipakṣa, asiddha and bādhita'. Duṣṭa hetu is that which possess doṣās viz. vyabhicāra virodha etc. Anumiti is obstructed when the knowledge of the dōṣās occur in the hetu.

Naiyāyika considers the pratibhandhakatvābhāva as a common cause for the production of the effect because pratibhandhaka always obstructs the production of it. Here anumiti which is also an effect must have this cause prior to its production. Hetvābhāsa jñāna which obstructs the anumiti or parāmarśa is defined in three ways by Gangeśopādhyāya[40].

Among these definitions,a topic in the second one is the content of the work of PRV. He discusses about the meaning of the case 'Tṛtīya' in the term "yatviṣayakatvena" and it is accepted as 'avacchedakatva'. Then the 'avacchedaka' can be qualified as 'svarūpasambhandha' or 'anatirikta vrittitva'. While discussing about these issues he says that the 'pratibandhakatva' is to be approved to a definite knowledge qualified with another definite knowledge (niścayaviśiṣṭa niścaya). For example in the inference 'Lake posses fire as there is smoke (hrado vahnimān dhūmāt) the hṛda is pakṣa, fire is sādhya and smoke is the hetu. It is an example for the hetvābhāsa viz. satpratipakṣa because we can point out

another hetu which can prove the absence of sādhya in the pakṣa - the absence of fire in the lake can be proved by another hetu viz. water. We are sure that the lake is possessing water and if there is water there will not be fire. So the nature of 'pratibandhakatva' is in the form of a qualified knowledge i.e. 'jalavyāpaka vahnyabhāva iti niścaya viśiṣṭa jalavat hrada viṣayaka niścayatvena rūpeṇa'. This 'jalavat hrada niścayatva' is discussed elaborately in the text by PRV.

The next contribution to Nyāya śāstra by PRV is a Bhūmika written for the 'Nacaratnamālikā' of Śāstrṣarman. It is a brief and significant essay which includes many contemporary problems, the traditional sāstric study has to face. At the beginning of this essay Parikṣit seems to be so anxious about the future of it because it is not conducive to wealth, respect and fame[41]. But this condition is changing because new trends are seeing i.e new Sanskrit colleges are establishing, the students and scholars of śāstra are encouraging. In this condition, the scholar like Māntiṭṭa Kuñju Nampootiri is really a lightening star who is a traditional scholar in all the branches of learning especially in Nyāya and who have wrote many works in Nyāya and Sāhitya. PRV gives a summary of the content of NRM taking the āvalis (chapters) one by one. So it serves as a great help to enter that scholarly work.

IV. Māntiṭṭa Kunju Nampootiri - the author of Nacaratnamālikā (1876 - 1959)

Śāstṛśarman well known as Panditarājan Māntiṭṭa Kunju Nampootiri is a famous Naiyāyika from Kerala in the nineteenth century A.D. His Magnum Opus - Nacaratnamālikā is really a valuable contribution to the wealth of 'Vāda prasthāna'. He was also a poet who has composed many other works viz. a devotional poem Gangātarangiṇī with Viswanāthāṣṭaka and the message poem Cātakasandeśa.

Education and Life

Śāstṛśarman was a native of Venkitangu near Guruvayoor in Trissur district. He was born in 1876 as the second son of Subrahmaṇyan Nampootiri, a great vedic Pandit and Parvathy Antarjanam. The family name was Māntiṭṭa. The elder brother of Śarman, Śrī Vāsudevan Nampootiri became a great Vaiyākaraṇa and his younger brother Subrahmaṇyan Nampootiri was a Naiyāyika.

SS was known by the pet name Kunju in his childhood and Śarma' is the term added to denote brahmins[42]. He was initiated into formal education at the age of seven. SS began to learn Ṛgveda Samhita with Pada in the family temple of Śankara Nārayana. Śarma in the

Cātakasandeśa remembers this temple as a place where even now Nampootiri's study Veda[43]. Higher studies in Veda were started at the age of fifteen in the Brahmaswam Maṭhom Trissur. Basic Nyāya and Sāhitya were studied from Panditarajan Rāmaśāstry.

Śarma reached Kotungallur at the age of eighteen for higher studies in Nyāya. This Gurukulam, a famous centre of all kinds of traditional learning was adorned with many great scholars. Śarma studied Nyāya under GBT. This Tampuran was well versed in many śāstras but was unparallel in Indian logic. The Natural intelligence and effort of the student attracted the teacher and 'Kunjikkāvu Tampuraṭṭi' the niece of Bhaṭṭan Tampuran was given to him as his wife. This Tampuraṭṭi also was a well versed scholar who was adorned with the title "Panditarāja" by the king of Cochin Royal Family. So Śarma got a co-sharer in the intellectual persuit as his wife.

Śarma was a permanent participant in the 'Śāstra Sadas' at Tripunithura. He was duly respected by the kings and scholars of that sadas who showed the wast knowledge and deep thinking in that sadas. The participants were amazed by his deep scholarship. Panditarājan Acyuta potuval remarks that Śarma's learned performance in such sadas was astonishing to all scholars around. The historic encounter in one of

these conference between the aged Śrīnivasācārya from Kānchipuram who was known as Śingalācārya and the young Śarma has been described by many Paṇḍits to that of Bhīṣmācārya and Arjuna in the battle field of Kurukṣetra[44]. Śarma defeated Śingalācārya who was a terror to Paṇḍits and won the title of honour "Tārkikatilaka" from the Mahāraja of Cochin.

As a recognition to his scholarship Śarma was appointed as the teacher in Śree Śeṣācārya Samskṛta Pāṭhaśāla by Rājarṣi Tampuran. Later he was appointed as the professor of Nyāya in the Śāstra Mahāpāṭhaśāla. Śarma had unequal knowledge in other śāstras like Vyākaraṇa and Sāhitya but his special interest laid in the Akṣapāda darśana and there in Vādagrantha was his favourite field. The Vāda granthas are treatises which includes strong arguments and discussions about the topics in a śāstra. The study, discussion and composing of these kinds of books were regarded as interesting sports by them, which were really an exercise for developing the intellectual powers. PRV remarks that one can not point out even a single part in the works like Tattva cintāmaṇi or in its commentaries - Dīdhiti, Jāgadīśi, Gādādhari - or in its wide interpretations, which is not thought about by them, making the night as a day[45]. Śarma's intellect was much interested in the more

higher works known as Kroḍapatra-s. Moreover the intellect was nourished by the acquaintance with great scholars in Nyāya and Mīmāmsā. Śrī Setumādhava deekṣitar, the grandson of Śeṣācārya and king Rājarṣi are to be noted here. Śarma himself says frequently that the acquaintance with Setumādhava deekṣitar is the main reason that he could enter the higher treatises like the Kroḍa patra which are very difficult to enter and even more difficult to come out[46].

SS served in the Mahāpāṭhaśāla for a long time with the blessings of Rājarṣi and other scholars. He was so lucky to have distinguished disciples like T. Rama Warrier, C.K. Raman Nambiar, K. Acyuta poduvāl and P.C. Vāsudevan Elayath. There were only very few persons like Śarma who spent the whole life for attaining and distributing knowledge and who lived only for the cause of knowlege.

Śarma was a great devotee of Śiva and was always seen worshiping Śiva with bilvapatras. His life was pure and chaste following all the ritual practises. People approached him with hesitation whether he is approachable or not but his innocent friendship and patronage made him approachable to the people as well as for his students to clear their doubts.

Honours Received

After RRV the next Mahārāja of Cochin known as Dhārmika cakravarthy awarded to Śarman the title of honour "Panditarājan". This was the greatest honour conferred on scholars of outstanding erudition. The same Rāja awarded the golden "Vīraśṛṅgala" three times to Śarma. Śarma retired from his official position in 1931 but was retained in the Palace as the 'Āsthana Paṇḍita'. The Cattarji commission instituted by the Government of India for the encouragement of Sanskrit studies accepted many valuable suggestions from him[47]. Weakened by diseases of old age this valuable life breathed his last in the year 1959.

Contemporary Nyāya scholars respected with Sāstṛ Śarman in Tripunithura

K. Rāmapiṣāroty (1876-1947) and Cennamangalam Ayyā Śāstṛikal were the other scholars entitled by RRV with SS as Sahṛdayatilaka and Śābdikatilaka.

K. Rāmapiṣāroṭy (1876-1947)

K. Rāmapiṣāroṭy, a great authority in Poetry and Nyāya was considered as the outer life (bahiścaraprāṇa) of Parīkṣit. He was a friend

of Pariksit and they spent most of their time with śāstric discussion and they jointly produced a commentary for Abhijñāna Śākuntala known as Sārārthadeepikā. Ramapisāroty came to Tripunithura at the age of eleven and studied under Rājarṣi. Higher works in Nyāya were studied from Mādhavācarya in the royal palace with PRV. Then he continued his studies under Kumbhakonam Śāstrikal. In the year 1890 at the age of 23 Rāmapiṣaroṭi became the teacher of Śeṣācārya Pāṭhaśāla and was a permanent participant in the 'Śāstra sadas'. His sad demise was on 1947.

Works of Rāma Pisāroty are Rāmavarma daśaka a khanda kāvya. Tippaṇi for Citramīmāmsa, Dinakarīya and Vyutpattivāda. His interest laid in teaching Nyāya and Alankāra. He travelled all over Kerala and collected valuable manuscripts from Cochin and Malabar and they were donated to the Cochin Palace library.

Cennamangalam Ayyā Śāstṛikal (1864-1945)

Cennamangalam Ayyā Śāstṛikal was another brilliant scholar who was graded in the first category and choosen to be the first receipent of Mahārāja's 'Panditarāja gold medal'. He was appointed as the teacher in the Pāṭhaśāla Tripunithura. Another honour is the title 'Śābdikatilaka'

received from Rājarṣi along with SS. He was reluctant to write anything.

Āttūr Kriṣṇa Piṣāroti

Attur Kriṣṇa Piṣāroti is the friend of SS from his student days in Kotungallur Gurukulam. He received the "Panditarāja" title from the Śāstra sadaś of Tripunithura. The title 'Kavitāratna' is received from the 'Vidwad sadas', Ayodya. Piṣāroty's special attention was for the enlightenment of Malayalam literature. His scholarship in interpretation, publication, translation and research is recognized by the scholarly society. Āttūr published three works of his preceptor Godavarma Bhattan Tampuran viz. Upahāraprakāśikā, Śaktitatvaprakāśikā and Siddhāntamālā.

P.S. Ananta Nārayaṇa Śāstry (1885-1957)

P.S. Ananta Nārayana Śāstry, another contemporary Nyāya scholar of SS belonged to Trissur. He was a dependent of Ramavarma of Cochin. Tarkasāra is a Nyāya work written by him. As its title refers it is a summary of the main principles of Tarka śāstrá. In the beginning of the work it is said that it is written for the use of beginners who wish to study Nyāya[48]. This work is a true follower of Tarkasamgrahá which deals with the categories of Nyāya vaiśeṣika in a simple style.

V. Commentators of Nūtanāloka

Three disciples of Māntiṭṭa, viz. C.K. Raman Nambiar, K. Acyuta Potuval and T. Rama Warrier jointly wrote a sub commentary to Nacaratnamālikā. Śarma's commentary is known as Nūtanāloka and the disciple's commentary is the Ālokaprakāśa. These commentaries serves as great help to get the explanations of the sentences given by the author. At times they quote the ideas from vedas and purāṇas as supportive to their views. Many incidental topics are included and exhaustively discussed in this commentary.

C.K. Rāman Nambiār

C.K. Raman Nambiar was a reputed Nyāya scholar who contributed to the Nacaratnamālikā in the form of the sub commentary Ālokaprakāśa. He was the professor of Nyāya in the Sanskrit College, Tripunithura, and was honoured by the king PRV by awarding the title "Panditarāja".

Raman Nambiar was born in 1900 in the Kuzuppilli Mathom at Vallachira village in Trissur district. His parents were Polapurath Putiyedath Govindan Nambiar and Kunnippilly Nangiaramma. Early education was at Palapurath. Sanskrit was studied under Pazhedath Nampootiri. Higher studies were in the Samskṛita Pāṭhaśāla, Tripunithura.

Māntiṭṭa Kunju Nampootiri is the main teacher who taught Nyāya. After passing ' Nyāya bhūṣaṇa' - the title exam Nambiar was appointed as the tutor in Nyāya in the same institution. Later he was promoted as lecturer and principal.

Raman Nambiar was the chief editor of the journal - Ravivarma Saṃskṛta Grantāvalī - and wrote many short essays and ślokas in it. The Govt. of India recognised his scholarship and a fellowship was awarded. Even now his wife Amminiyamma belonging to Kadekuzhi family near Tripunithura is receiving the financial help from the Central Government.

An essay seen in the Journal titled, 'Tarka śāstra'[49] shows the scholarship of Sri Nambiar. It is an essay in which he gives a short history of Nyāya vaiśeṣika system of Indian philosophy. Nambiar is of opinion that this śāstra is conducive for the betterment of man in this world and for attaining Mokṣa in another world. He further remarks that the difference between Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika lies in the nature of treatment not in the content. The unique quality of Nyāya śāstra is that it accepts the importance of anumāna which is the most required means of knowledge for all śāstras[50]. Udayanācārya and other philosophers uses the anumāna more than any other pramāṇa. Raman Nambiar further

holds that Pāṇinīyam is used to know the proper words to denote the objects and Kaṇāda is conducive to know the object and thereby the right knowledge can be attained by these śāstras[51]. At the end of this essay he seems to be anxious about the present condition of Nyāya śāstra that people without studying this śāstra, argues like a 'Vaitaṇṭika' and so the śāstra itself is known as 'Kutarka'. Nambiar concludes the essay by saying that even then there exists two or three eminent scholars. Among them the first one is His Highness Parīkṣit Rāmavarma and the second person is Sri Māntitta Kuncu Nampootiri, the honourable teacher of the author. They ornates the 'Parampara' of Gadādhara bhatta and at the end he express his devotion and reverence to these eminent scholars.

K. Acyuta Potuvāl (1898-1972)

K. Acyuta Potuvāl is the disciple of Śāstṛśarman, and Meladath Govindan Nambiar. He was awarded with the title Panditarājan from the Cochin Royal Palace and was appointed as the Professor of Nyāya in the 'Śeṣācārya Mahāpaṭhaśāla. It is said that Acyuta Potuvāl was a permanent participant in Śāstra sadas and attracted the participants by his sweet and musical sānskrit.

Acyuta Potuvāl was the sub editor of the Ravivarma Samskṛta

Journal published from the Pāṭhaśāla once in three months and C.K. Rāman Nambiar was the chief editor. After the retirement of C.K. Rāman Nambiar, Acyuta Potuvāl had taken that position. He had written many essays and short poems in that journal.

Acyuta Potuvāl is the author of many works viz. Vilāpasaptati, Mātṛnivedana, Parīkṣit carita, Śivastuti, Laghūgīti and Bhaktirasāyana beside the commentary to NUA. Among these works 'Vilāpasaptati' is a poem in 700 stanzas bemoaning the death of Rājarṣi Rāmavarma. Parīkṣit carita is a Khaṇḍa kāvya which describes the life history of Parīkṣit Tampuran in four sargas. The others are stotra works in which the use of alankarās and the depiction of rasa are so attractive and that surpass even the Parīkṣit carita. The sub commentary - Āloka prakāśa shows the deep knowledge of the author in Nyāya as well as that of Śruti smṛiti, Upaniṣadś and Purāṇa.

T. Rama Warrier

Trikovil Rama Wārrier was a familiar and respected Āyurvedic physician for the inhabitants of Tripunithura. He was also a Nyāya scholar who joined with C.K. Raman Nambiar and K. Acyuta Potuvāl to compose the commentary for Nacaratnamālikā. Rama Wārrier was respected by

the king of Cochin Roayal Family by awarding the title 'Panditarājan'.

T. Rama Warrier was born in 1897 A.D. in the Trikkovil Warriyam in Valluvanad Taluk as the son of Kuttypiṣārasyār and Podumana Kṛṣṇan Nampootiri. After the primary education in his birth place, he reached Tripunithura with his uncle Uzutra Wārrier who was the professor of Ayurveda in the Samskṛta Mahāpaṭhaśāla and the Āyurveda physician in royal palace. The remaining education of Rāma Warrier was at Tripunithura. He joined in the Samskṛta Pāṭhaśāla and studied Nyāya from the reputed Nyāya teacher Māntitta Kunju Nampootiri and passed the Nyayabhūṣaṇa. He got the traditional knowledge of Āyurveda from his uncle and took the title 'Āyurveda bhūṣaṇa'. After the education he served for two years as the teacher of Āyurveda in the Madras university. In 1933 he was appointed as the Āyurveda teacher in the place of his uncle in the Pāṭhaśāla at Tripunithura.

T. Rāma Warrier spent most of his time in the Palace holding the position of "Kottaram Vaidyan". Nyāya also was his favourite subject and until death he enthusiastically participated in the Vākyartha sadas held at Tripunithura, and Sringeri. After the retirement from the Samskṛta Pāṭhaśāla he served as the Sanskrit teacher in Palace school and retired from there when this school was handed over to the Government. As his

wish Rāma Warrier's last days were at Kāśi. He breated his last in 1978 A.D.

Thus the members of Cochin Royal Family had served a lot for the development of the Sanskrit language and Śāstra. Nyāya was the subject which is studied handled and taught by most of the kings of this Royal Family. Their contribution can be evaluated from the existing śāstra works composed by them. The chain of Naiyāyikas continues in this state as the flames of lamps lightened from another lamp.

References:

1. vide. Keraliya Samskrta Sāhitya Caritram, Vadakkumkur, Sahitra pravarthaka co-operative society, 1962, Part 1 p-4.

2. vide. TCKSL p- XVII

3. See Ibid, chapters 1 to 6

4. Ibid, p-91

5. vide. unninīlisandeśa Part II, verse 14.

6. vide. *यो न्यायकणिकाव्याख्यामकरोत् परमेश्वर*
   तस्य पौत्रेण तत्सूनोरेवान्तेवासिना मया
   इति गोपाल्सूनु ऋषेः पितूरनुग्रहात्
   अन्तेवासी पितृव्यस्य भवदासस्य धीमतः

   Nititattvavirbhava vyakhya.

7. *तथा च तत्र भवन्तः षड्दर्शनीयपारदृश्वत्वे सत्यपि विशेषतः कौमारिल्तन्त्रस्वातन्त्र्यवत्तया विवृततत्वाविर्भाव तत्वबिन्दुस्पोटसिद्धयोऽस्मत्पितामहापादाः विभ्रमविवेकव्याख्यायाम्*

   Jaiminīya Sūtrartha Sangraha of Parameśwara II, p.49

8. KSSC vol. V, p- 556

9. KSC vol. V, p-214

10. Ibid, p-214

11. KSSC vol. VI, p-502

12. KSSC vol. IV, p-317

13. Ibid, p-306

14. vide. KSC vol. V, p-221

15. KSSC vol. IV, p-312

16. KSSC vol. V, p-254

17. vide. Vyutpattivādasiddhantamāla - edited by Dr. P.C. Muralimādhavan, p-36

18. KSSC Vol. V., p-317

19. Ibid, p-318

20. Ibid, p-317

21. Ibid, pp - 337-348

22. Vyutpattivādasiddhantamāla - op.cit, p-15

23. vide. *अस्त्येव शठकोपाख्यगुरूकारुण्यतो*
मम सामर्थ्यमीदृशे कर्मण्यतिमन्दमतेरपि
Vyutpattivādasiddhāntamāla - karika 3

24. KSC vol. V, p - 224

25. Ibid, p-219

26. Ibid, p-217

27. *शास्त्रं युक्त्या विशदयति यः साधुपाणिन्युपज्ञम्*
शिष्यानध्यापयति सततं गौतमोपक्रमञ्च ।
वेदान्तसुचरित परिचयाद्धर्मशास्त्रे विदग्धो
वन्थ्य सोऽयं मम गुरूवरो भट्टगोदक्षितीश ॥ C.S., sl. 22

28. vide. *एकपदार्थे अपरपदार्थस्य संसर्गः संसर्गमर्यादया भासते* - Vyutpattivāda of Gadādharabhattācārya opening lines.

29. vide. *यदिच्छयैव शब्दानामर्थोपस्थितिहेतुता*
सर्वेषां स शिवो भूयादर्थोपस्थितये Vyutpatti Siddhāntamāla, karikā I

30. vide. Ravivarma Samskrta Granthāvali - Edited by Panditarājan Achyuta Potuvāl 1961 October Book No.9. November 18., p-1

31. Ibid, p-3

32. KSSC Vol. V, p-186

33. KSC Vol. V, p-224

34. HIL, p-392

35. vide. *नत्वा पूर्णत्रयीशनाथं देवदेवं श्रियपतिम्*
गुरूंश्च करुणासिन्धून् परिभाव्य च तद्गिरः
भाषापरिच्छेदमुखग्रन्थस्य रत्नेषु टिप्पणी
परीक्षिदपराख्येन रच्यते रामवर्मणा Subodhini Mangalasloka

36. Avatārika of Subodhini, p-1

37. Subodhini, p-1

38. vide. *इत्थं चोपसर्गाणां इत्यादि तरङ्गिणी ग्रन्थः परैरत्र कृताक्षेपश्च चिन्त्यः* Ibid, p-3

39. vide. *मारुतपूर्णरन्ध्रत्वोपलक्षितेत्यनुक्त्वा, विशिष्टेत्युक्तवता महादेव भट्टेनावस्थाविशेष विशिष्ट वेणावेव कीचकपदप्रयोगः स्वारसिकः नतु जाति विशेष विशिष्ट इत्यपि स्पुटीकृतम्* Ibid, p-3

40. vide. *तत्र अनुमितिकारणी भूताभावप्रतियोगि यथार्थज्ञानविषयत्वम्, यद्विषयकत्वेन लिङ्गज्ञानस्य अनुमितिप्रतिबन्धकत्वम्, ज्ञायमानं सत् अनुमिति प्रतिबन्धकं यत् तत्वं वा* - Tattvacintamani of Gangeśopādhyaya Part II, p-763

41. vide. - *संस्कृतशास्त्राध्ययनं लाभपूजाख्यातिषु पूरेवाधुना नोपकुरुत इति तदेतत् त्रयमेव हि प्रधानं कामनास्पदं मुख्यं प्रवृत्तिलक्ष्यञ्च लोकस्य* - Bhūmika to NRM, PRV, p - *क*

42. शर्मान्तं ब्राह्मणानां इति स्मृतिमनुसृत्य शास्तृशर्मेत्युक्तम् Alokaprakaśa, p-24

43. CS, sl. - 8

44. Avatārika to GT, Achyuta Potuvāl, p-III

45. Bhūmika to NRM, p - घ

46. Ibid, p - ङ

47. CS, Edited by Dr. Muralīmādhavan, p-XX

48. vide. तर्कशास्त्रपठने प्रारिप्सूनामुपकाराय पुतुकोट ग्रामाभिजनेन एस् अनन्तनारायण शास्त्रिणा संकलितं सोपज्ञसंकेत परम्पराभिरत्यन्त दुर्बोधतमं जनानां तर्क विधातुं सुगमं समेषां संगृह्य सारं कल्यामि किञ्चित् - introduction of Tarkasāra

49. vide. Ravivarma Sanskrit series 1959 January, p-4

50. Ibid, p-4

51. काणादं पाणिनीयं च सर्वशास्त्रोपकारकम् । Ibid, p-4

CHAPTER II

SOURCE AND ORIGIN OF IDEAS EXPLAINED IN NACARATNAMĀLIKĀ

Nacaratnamālikā of Śāstṛsarman is a valuable contribution to the 'Vāda prasthāna' in Navya Nyāya system. It deals with a definition of 'Vyāpti' given by Pragalbhācārya[1]. Two definitions known as Pragalbha lakṣaṇa are included among the Cadurdaśalakṣaṇī (fourteen definitions of Vyāpti) in the Dīdhiti of Raghunāthaśiromaṇi which is in turn the commentary of the basic work on Navya Nyāya viz. Tattvacintāmaṇi. It discusses the concept of Vyāpti in detail quoting the earlier definitions.

'Vyāptijñāna' (knowledge of invariable concomitance) is the most important pre-requisite for the production of 'anumiti' (inferential knowledge). Nyāya approves four kinds of valid knowledge viz. pratyakṣa, anumiti, upamiti and śābda and means of those valid knowledge are pratyakṣa, anumāna, upamāna and śabda respectively[2].

Nyāya - A Pramāṇa Śāstra

The theory of knowledge and how knowledge originates were favourable topics of discussion in all systems of Indian Philosophy. Every system formulate their own theory in accordance with their accepted

ontology. The primary aim of all philosophical system is considered as the attainment of true knowledge and thereby achieve the final goal ie. Mokṣa. The possibility of error in experience necessitates an enquiry into the truthfulness and they have to distinguish the true knowledge from the false one. Such a study which is a systematic reflection concerning knowledge itself as its object is known as 'Espistemology' in western philosophy. The same concept is included in the 'Pramāna śāstra' of Indian Philosophy. Nyāya śāstra which is known as 'Pramāna śāstra' justifies the title by the prime importance that is given to Pramāṇa. It undertakes a detailed analysis and classification of the forms of knowledge, its definition, division, instruments and errors.

The Prominence given to Pramāṇa-s in Nyāya system

The first systematic treatment about the means of knowledge is found in the Nyāya sūtra of Akṣapāda (150 A.D.)[3]. The first category to be discussed in it is Pramāṇa[4] (the means of right knowledge). Vātsyāyana (400 A.D.) the first commentator starts his bhāṣya with a statement that 'Pramāṇato'rtha Pratipattau Pravṛttisāmarthyād Arthavat Pramāṇam'[5]. Which means Pramāṇa becomes fruitful through the successful activity on knowing the things rightly by the Pramāṇas. He further says that there is no cognition of objects without the instruments

of knowledge and without the cognition of objects there is no successful activity, one who is, being guided by the desire to seek or to shun of objects led to activity is the knower (Pramātṛ) and Pramāṇa is the instrument by which the knower rightly knows the object. Prameya is the object to be known and Pramiti is the right knowledge. Among them Pramāṇa deserves prior mention and Pramātā, Prameya and Pramiti become invariably related to the objects only by virtue of Pramāṇa being related. According to Vātsyāyana the 'tattva' (reality) reaches its fulfilment in these four[6]. Hence it is clear that from the time of Prācīna Nyāya itself the priority to the issue of Pramāṇa is accepted. But a characteristic feature of Navya Nyāya is that it confines its treatment of theory of knowledge as a separate topic by itself. The first Hindu logician who dealt with the theory of knowledge as a separate subject is Bhāsarvajña (950 A.D.)[7]. But his work Nyāya sāra approves only three Pramāṇās i.e Perception, inference and verbal testimony. So Tattvacintāmaṇi is considered to be the first work in which an elaborate and systematic treatment to the theories of pramāṇās alone is found and which approves the four pramāṇa theory accepted by Gautama.

The concept of Pramāṇa

The term 'pramāṇa' is derived from the root 'mā' with a prefix

'pra' and suffix 'lyut'. With this 'lyut' the word pramana can literally give two meanings - one is the valid cognition (prama) when the suffix 'lyut' is used in the abstract (bhave) sense. Secondly it means the instrument of valid knowledge when the suffix denotes the Karana (instrument). In Indian philosophy it is used in these two senses but Nyaya generally uses the term Pramana in the second sense. Vatsyayana also gives definition of pramana in this sense[8]. Hence Prama and Karana are the two components of Pramana.

Prama (valid knowledge)

Prama is the technical term uses for valid knowledge. The term 'upalabdhi' is also used for valid knowledge by Gautama and Vatsyayana[9]. But it can even denotes invalid knowledge, so to avoid ambiguity the term 'prama' is usually used for valid knowledge and 'aprama' is used for invalid knowledge. In the Nyayabhasya, Vatsyayana defines 'tattva' (reality) as the positivity of the positive and the negativity of the negative i.e when a positive object is known as positive, as it actually is, rather than as its contradictory it becomes 'tattva' and when a negative object is known as negative i.e in its actual nature rather than its contradictory it becomes the 'tattva' of 'asat'[10].

The Navya Nyāya definition of valid knowledge is that knowledge in which the attribute is a qualifier and the object is the qualificand. For example - the apprehension of silverness in silver. The invalid knowledge is that the knowledge in which the attribute is a qualifier in an object in which the attribute does not exist. For example the apprehension of silverness in a piece of pearl[11].

Karaṇa (instrument)

Nyāya accepts the 'Asatkāryavāda', i.e the theory that the effect (kārya) does not pre-exist in its material cause. According to Nyāya, effect is a new production. Each effect has some causes and it approves three kinds of causes viz. Samavāyi kārana, Asamavāyi kāraṇa and Nimitta kāraṇa. Knowledge which also is considered to be an effect must have some causes (kāraṇa) like senses, contact etc. The Naiyāyikās hold that the karaṇa is a special kind of cause (kāraṇa). Cause is the invariable precedent for producing a product and among these causes the uncommon cause is called the karaṇa.

There is difference of opinion about the concept of karaṇa. The most popular definition for karaṇa is "vyāpāravadasādhāraṇam kāraṇam" - which means, that uncommon cause which possesses the operative

force (vyāpāra). Vyāpāra is defined as 'tajjanyatve sati tajjanya janakatvam'. For example in the inferential process parāmarśa, which is produced from vyāptijñāna and from which inferential knowledge (anumiti) is produced, is the 'vyāpāra'. That which possesses this 'vyāpāra' is the 'vyāptjñāna' and it is considered as the karaṇa. In the other definition of karaṇa - "sādhakatamam karaṇam" - the sādhakatama is defined as atiśayena sādhakam - and that atiśaya is the productivity of the effect. Another defintion "phalāyogavyavacchinnam kāraṇam" - means karana is the cause which preceds immediately before the effect. So linga parāmarśa which preceds immediately before the inferential knowledge can be considered as a karaṇa. (Anumiticaraṇa kāraṇa liṅga parāmarśa)[12].

Jayantabhaṭṭa (10th Centuary A.D.) the celebrated author of Nyāyamañjari holds another view that karaṇa and kāraṇa can not be isolated. The totality of all the causes preceding the effect is called a karaṇa. The aggregate of all the factors which are intellectual or non intellectual can be considered as karaṇa[13]. This concept is called 'Sāmagrīkāraṇavāda'. According to him a joint collocation is the chief instrument for sometimes the absence of a single element is sufficient to stop the production of that effect.

The production of a cognition depends upon many causes. But we don't say a man sees with the collocation of the causal conditions. The ordinary usage is a man sees with his eyes[14]. There the invariable productivity is ascribed to the visual organ. Likewise, we are using sentences like 'a man walks with his legs' or 'he kills the enemy with an arrow' etc. Hence the nature of the most effectiveness have invariable productivity and it is attributed to the legs and arrow respectively. It does not means legs or arrow are the only cause of the effect.

Kaṇāda in the sūtra "Aduṣṭam vidyā" brings to notice the concept of pramā as free from defects[15]. Vātsyāyana employes two factors i.e cause and cognition. The successors of Vātsyayana kept on improving the definition of pramāṇa. Jayanta brings into two novel ideas in his definition viz. the collocation of conditions and their conscious and unconscious nature. The Mīmāmsakās maintain that pramāṇa is that which apprehends an object hitherto unknown and which is free from defects of its cause and which is uncontradicted. Nārāyaṇa bhaṭṭa in his Mānameyodaya states the Bhāṭṭa view that the valid knowledge is produced from the valid instruments and valid knowledge means the knowledge of unknown objects. Here the word unknown is used to exclude the recollection (smṛti) and restatement (pratyabhijña) which are having

known objects. No novelty is a necessary condition for being a pramāṇa[16].

The Buddhist definition of pramāṇa also seems to be similar to that of Bhaṭṭa. According to them an object which is known by perception can not be known by any other pramāṇa and they admit only two pramāṇas. So the means of right knowledge is only that which apprehends an object hitherto unknown. In addition to this, another special feature is also pointed out by later Buddhist that a congnition is a pramāṇa which is not contradicted by subsequent experience. The cognition is accepted as valid,only when it enables the person to attain the object pointed out by it. This special feature i.e "avisaṃvādakatva" of cognition might have been introduced to defend the Buddhist theory of pramāṇa against the attacks of the opponents like the Naiyāyikas.

Forms of valid knowledge

Nyāya recognizes four kinds of valid knowledge viz. perception, inference, comparison and verbal testimony. There by there are four kinds of pramāṇa (means of valid knowledge) i.e 'pratyakṣa', 'anumāna', 'upamāna' and 'śabda'. The principle underlying the division of the valid knowledge into four depends upon the difference of the causal collocation

which generates the knowledge as well as the characteristics of each of the four. The same thing which appeared as the object of perception may become the object of inference[17] but the manner or mode of manifestation of knowledge being different these are to be held as different. Another pramāṇas accepted by the other philosophers viz. 'arthāpatti', 'anupalabdhi', 'sambhava', 'aitihya' and 'ceṣṭa' are included in any of these four pramāṇas[18].

Anumāna a major Pramāṇa

In the Nyaya sūtra "pratykṣānumānopamānaśabhaḥ pramāṇāni", the first place is given to pratyakṣa which is an independent prāmāṇa and approved by all philosophers including the Cārvākas. But the most important method of knowledge in the Nyāya system is the second one i.e anumāna. Its nature, form and content have been discussed by all the writers leading to the development of an elaborate literature. The basic document of all these discussions is the Nyāya theory of inference marked by Gautama in the sūtra 'Atha tat pūrvakam trividhamanumānam pūrvavat, śeṣavat, sāmānyatodṛṣṭam ca'[19]. Although all schools have discussed the nature and other connected issues of anumāna in accordance with their philosophical views, the interest of schools other than Nyāya lies elsewhere and they have not bestowed much in this

subject. Das Gupta remarks that "Inference is the second means of proof and the most valuable contribution that Nyāya has made unequalled for its precise discussion and analysis"[20].

The term anumāna is formed from the root 'mā' by the addition of the prefix 'anu' and suffix 'lyuṭ'. It may mean an inferential congnition (anumiti) if the *suffix is taken in the sense of abstraction* (bhāve) or the instrument of inferential cognition if the suffix is taken in the sense of instrument (karaṇa). The components of the term 'anumāna' i.e 'anu' and 'māna' means, 'after' and 'cognition' respectively. Thus literally the term means the cognition or the instrument of cognition taking place after some other knowledge.

Importance of Anumāna in Nyāya System

The word Nyāya generally denotes right or justice but technically it denotes the components of parārthānumāna[21]. The definition of Nyāya according to Vātsyāyana is the examination of objects by the means of valid knowledge[22]. This defintion can be applied to the anumāna itself. Each of the components of parārthānumāna are proving the object with the help of any one of the pramaṇas i.e 'pratijña' is based on verbal testimony, 'hetu' is based on inference, 'udāharaṇa' on perception,

'upanaya' on analogy and 'nigamana' includes all these pramāṇas to prove an object[23]. Hence the word 'pramāṇaiḥ' literally mean by instruments of valid knowledge, may mean by the components of inference for others.

Moreover the term 'Ānvīkṣikī' which was used by Kauṭilya in his Arthaśāstra to denote the śāstras like sānkhya, yōga and lokāyata was later on adopted by Nyāyaśāstra because 'anu' literally means after and 'īkṣā' is the examination. So 'Ānvīkṣikī' is the knowledge of a thing produced after the examination which is known earlier by perception or verbal testimony. Because of the prominence given to anumāna in Nyāya system, it is later known as 'Ānvīkṣikī'[24].

According to Vācaspati misra the word 'artha' in the statement 'Pramāṇairartha parīkṣaṇam' denotes the hetu, so Nyāya is the examination of the hetu with the help of the five components. A genuine inference cannot be contradicted by perception or scripture because its components are already based on pramāṇas of which perception and scripture are the strongest. Vātsyāyana concludes the interpretation of 'anumāna' with a comment to the importance of 'anumāna'. He says that Gautama expound the great and stupendous theme of inference in a brief aphorism. (Mahato mahāviṣayasya lagīyasā sūtreṇopadeśaḥ). He adds that perception which is generally accepted as the important pramāṇa,

has its objects that are present, but inference has its object both present and non present because of its capacity for knowing things belonging to three times. We infer - "It will be, it is, and it was"[25].

Our worldly life is carried out not on the basis of perception but depending on 'anumāna'. Perception is the basis of all kinds of knowledge and it is independent while inference is dependent on the previous knowledge. But perception can reveal objects only within the range of sense organ - i.e it can give the knowledge of present objects; but inference can give knowledge of the objects that are not connected with the sense organ.

Even the validity of perception is known by 'anumāna'. We are inferring the validity of knowledge through the successful activity it produces. So, for accepting the validity of pratyakṣa inference is needed[26]. Even though Cārvakās say that the inference can not be accepted as a special source of definite knowledge as there can be probability, but some sects of Cārvakās accept 'anumāna' which is not contradictory to perception.

In a society even though the help of an inference is taken in almost every step we are unaware of the fact that we are inferring some

objects. We infer many situations after seeing some sign or mark. In every day life the inference guides us to deal with our fellow people otherwise life become unpractical. We understand the minds of others depending on inference i.e by the mental status like pleasure pain etc which can be inferred from their different kinds of expressions or gestures. Sometimes the native place of a man can be inferred after observing his diet, language, dress etc. Thus innumerable instances of knowledge based on inference can be shown.

In the śāstra the existence of objects which are not perceptable like, 'adṛṣṭa', 'ātma' and God can easily be established with the help of inference. Nyāya proves the objects like 'atoms', 'ākāśa' and 'kāla' by the help of inference. It explains the origin of the universe by the combination of atoms. The theistic schools specially consider the inference as the most important means of knowledge to go above the sphere of grief or sorrow and attain the fullfillment of the life viz. of salvation. So inference has great utility in each and every sphere of our life and people who are having critical mind will always depend on anumana more than any other pramāṇa and the prominence of this inference can not be questioned.

Definition of Anumāna

Gautama the author of Nyāya sūtra defines inference in the sūtra. "Atha tatpūrvakam trividhamānumānam pūrvavat śeṣavatssāmānyatodṛṣṭam ca" i.e next is the anumāna preceded by that, is of three kinds, pūrvavat, śeṣavat and sāmānyatodṛṣṭa. In this sūtra the word anumāna stands for "what is to be defined (lakṣya) and the expression then preceded by it". (atha tatpūrvaka) stands for its defintion (lakṣaṇa).

Tatpūrvaka - The definition

In the expression "preceded by it" (tatpūrvaka) 'tat' stands for perception - which is the first means of knowledge defined just before the anumāna sūtra. So 'Pratyakṣa pūrvakatva' is the definition of inference. But though the reminiscent impression is also preceded by perception, which is not inference, the word jñāna is also added from the previous sūtra. Then the definition of inference is that it is a specific form of knowledge preceded by perception.

If the perception is taken in the general sense to mean any form of perception then the knowledge derived through verbal testimony would also come under inference becasue it is preceded by the perception of word (śabda). Therefore it is to be taken in a specific sense. Vātsyāyana

explains this term 'tat' (perception) in two fold. The first perception is of the invariable relation between linga (proban) and liṅgin (probandum). Secondly the perception of the hetu in the subject[27]. The linga is the real reason employed in the inferential process and lingin is the object actually to be inferred. The relation between the hetu and sādhya should be known previously to infer the sādhya from the hetu. The relation is that wherever the hetu exists there will be the sādhya because the hetu is vyāpya (pervaded) and sādhya is vyāpaka (pervader). Therefore the relation between them is that of vyāpya vyāpakabhāva or simply vyāpti. This relation between hetu and sādhya is understood by the previous perception of them jointly in many places. As for example when the fire is inferred from the smoke, the smoke is vyāpya (that which rests in few places ie only with fire) and fire is the vyāpaka (rests in larger places ie even without smoke). The principle is that if there is smoke there is fire because smoke will not exist without fire. Hence the existence of fire should necessarily be admitted in every case of smoke. So the perception is that of vyāpti and it is referred to by the term 'tatpūrvaka' though there is no mention of the term 'vyāpti'.

The second perception is that of the linga (lingadarśana) in the locus i.e the perception of smoke (valid hetu) in mountain. Hence

'anumāna' is, that knowledge of a 'lingi' obtained from the perception of the 'linga' which exists in the locus. But Navya Nyāya does not admits this perception of linga as a necessary pre requisite, according to it only the knowledge of the linga is enough.

Thus the process of inferential knwledge in pracīna Nyāya is as follows. First perceives the relation between linga and lingin (valid hetu and sādhya) - for example by the perception of smoke and fire as co-existing in the kitchen etc, it is called the first lingadarśana, perception of the hetu in the locus, that is perception of smoke in the mountain - it is the second perception. It awaken the impression which results in the recollection that, where there is smoke there will be fire. But this recollection does not immediately results in the inferential knowledge. It is followed by a further perception of smoke not as simply smoke but as the smoke which is invariably related to fire. Hence the form of the knowledge is that the smoke which is pervaded to fire exists in the mountain. This last perception is called the third perception of the hetu and it immediately yields the inferential knowledge that the 'mountain possesses fire'.

Vātsyāyana's opinion is further polished by Udyotakara. According to him all inferences do not pre suppose such previous perception. The

knowledge of hetu and its invariable relation with the sādhya may in some cases be derived through verbal testimony or by another inference. So Udyotakara's view is that the word 'tat' in the expression 'tat pūrvaka' (preceded by it) may grammatically be contrived to mean 'tāni' (these) i.e any of the four instruments of valid knowledge mentioned in the third sūtra[28]. But it must be noted that every inference is ultimately based on perception and without a previous perception there can be no inference. That is why Gautama defines inference as the knowledge preceded by perception.

Navya Nyāya view

Gaṅgeśa, the celebrated author of Tattvacintāmaṇi defines inference as the knowledge arising from the character of pakṣa as qualified by vyāpti[29]. This definition clearly shows that the 'karaṇa' of an inferential conclusion is not the hetu but the knowledge of invariable concomitance. Gaṅgeśa here strikes a note of difference with the view of Vātsyāyana. According to Vātsyāyana anumiti is the after knowledge of an object as the sādhya (liṅgi) through a hetu rightly ascertained[30]. This definition shows that the knowledge of Vyāpti is not the immediate cause of the inferential conclusion. Udyotakara clarified this point that the instruments of inferential knowledge are the perception of the sign as existing in the

subject of inference of which the last one viz. linga parāmarśa is the immediate cause. Linga parāmarśa implies the cognition of the presence of hetu in the subject of inference, together with the memory of its invariable concomitance with the sādhya.

Gangeśa also uses the term linga parāmarśa for the instrument of inferential knowledge, but he means by the word, is the knowledge of 'vyāpti' and not the sign which is being cognised in the subject. In the Siddhāntamuktāvalī of Viśwanātha Pancānana also this issue is raised and old view viz. the sign which is being concomitant with sādhya as the karaṇa; is refuted. He is of opinion that if cognition of the presence of hetu in the pakṣa be the effective cause, then there cannot be any inferential knowledge from the non present ie past or future marks[32].

As a matter of fact the apprehension of the existence of the vyāpya in the pakṣa is called the vyāpāra and the knowledge of vyāpti is the instrument of inference in Navya Nyāya school[33]. Just as in the act of cutting a tree the axe is the instrument of the action, cutting, the speedy conjunction of the axe with the tree is the vyāpara. (Intervening operative force that culminates the final effect of the separation of the tree). Similarly in the inference, the knowledge of vyāpti act as a karaṇa and the knowledge that the vyāpya (qualified with vyāpti) is existing in the pakṣa

is the vyāpāra and by this instrument the inferential knowledge is brought out[34].

Divisions of inference

In the NS "atha tat pūrvakam trividhamanumānam pūrvavat, śeṣavat, sāmānyatodṛṣṭam ca", Gautama speaks with the definition as well as the division of 'anumāna'. Bythe second part of the sūtra he classified anumāna into 'Pūrvavat', 'Śeṣavat' and 'Sāmānyatodṛṣṭa'. Vātsyāyana explains and illustrates this part in two ways. According to the first explanation the word 'pūrva' (antecedent) means a cause and śeṣa (consequent) means the effect. So pūrvavadanumāna means an inference which has for its proban the 'cause'. (Kāraṇa lingaka) for eg. from the rising of dark cloud we infer its effect i.e the future rain. Śeṣavat means an inference which has for its hetu the effect (kārya lingaka) for eg. by seeing the river full of water with leaves, foams, swiftness of current,we infer the cause i.e past rain on the mountain. Since there is a mutual relation between the cause and the effect, one is inferred from the other. Sāmānyatodṛṣṭa means an inference having its hetu as something other than cause and effect. This is the inference of an object, on the strength of an invariable relation perceived between two objects and which relation has acquired the status of generality, though that

relation is normally not perceptable. For eg-the movement of the sun or earth is normally imperceptable. However it is found in many places that if any object previously seen somewhere is seen at a different place it is only because of its motion. Through such general perception one infer that there is movement in the earth because the sun has seen at midday in a different place from where it has seen in the morning.

The other interpretation given by Vātsyāyana is that - Pūrvavat means as previously. When two objects were previously perceived as invariably related with each other and later on, an object among them is perceived somewhere else then the other is inferrred. For eg. smoke and fire were previously perceived in the kitchen as invariably related to each other, then the same kind of smoke is perceived in the hill, from this, fire is inferred in the hill. Śeṣavat means pariśeṣa (residual) resting on the residual (pariśeṣa) after the elimination of certain possible objects and because of the irrevalance in the cases of other objects. As for example in the case of sound by characterising as existent (sat) and non eternal (anitya) which are the common characteristics of substance quality and action, it is negated from abhāva, and from the universal and particularity because these are eternal categories. Then the doubt arises whether sound is substance quality or action. We can eliminate as follows

- sound is not substance because it has only a single substance as the inherent cause viz. 'ākāśa' and it is not action because action is not the cause of a subsequent action, but sound arises from sound, then it is that which is the residual, and thus sound is inferred to be a quality.

'Sāmānyatodṛṣṭa' is that inference, where the relation between the hetu and sādhya being imperceptible, the sādhya is known from a hetu having the same nature with any other object. As for example self (soul) is inferred from desire cognition etc because desire cognition etc. are qualities and qualities reside only in substances. Therefore that substance which is the locus of these qualities is inferred as the self (ātma).

According to Udyotakara the three forms of inference referred to in the sūtra may as well be called 'anvayi', 'vyatireki' and 'anvayavyatireki'[35]. But this 'division of anumiti' based on vyāpti has not so advanced at the period of Gautama, so this opinion seems not to be right. Other interpretation for three form of inferences is that 'pūrvavat' is meant for a proban which proves something belonging to the past, by śeṣavat, a proban which proves something belonging to the future, and by sāmānyatodṛṣṭa a proban which proves something belonging to the present. Udyotakara puts another opinion that there are a number of

divisions for inference and the term trividha is used in the sūtra to denote all these inferences[36].

Other views

Praśastapādācārya - the author of Padārthadharmasangraha speaks of two kinds of anumāna viz. drṣṭa and sāmānyatodrṣṭa[37]. Among them drṣta is that inference of a previously known case and the inferred case is exactly of the same class. Thus for eg-it can be pointed out that, by perceiving that, only a cow has a hanging mass of flesh in its neck (sāsna) wherever we see the same hanging mass of flesh at the neck of an animal we infer that 'it is a cow'. If on the strength of nature the inference is extended to a different class of objects it is called sāmānyatodrṣta. For eg-perceiving that the work of farmers, merchants etc are rewarded with good results. We may infer that the actions of the sacrificer i.e the performance of sacrifices etc will be rewarded with the results.

The later logicians divided inference into svārtha (for one's own sake) and parārtha (for other's sake). Among them the 'svārthanumāna' need not be stated in any logical form. A man by the repeated observation of the co-existence of smoke and fire in the kitchen etc understands that

smoke to be the invariable concomitant of fire. Then he perceives smoke on a hill, and he recollects that wherever there is smoke there is fire. After this recollection he has the knowledge that the hill has the smoke which is pervaded by fire. Lastly there arises the inferential knowledge that the hill is fiery. This is the example of svārthānumāna. When one wish to make understand his previous knowledge to others he employs five membered syllogism (re course of five sentences technically known as pancāvayava) it is called parārthānumāna. The five members can be noted with suitable examples as follows.

1. Pratijñā	Proposition	The hill has fire
2. Hetu	Ground	because it has smoke
3. Udāharaṇa	example	to show the invariable concomitance (vyāpti) if there is smoke there is fire as in the kitchen
4. Upanaya	confirmatory cognition	The hill has smoke which is invariably associated with fire as in the kitchen
5. Nigamana	corroborative conclusion	Therefore this hill has fire.

The final 'linga parāmarśa' is produced from the śābda bodha of

these five members[38] and anumiti is produced for others also from this 'lingaparāmarśa'.

It has been contended by the Mīmāmsakas that the first three or the last three of the five steps in the logical inference are sufficient to produce the inferential conclusion[39]. The vedāntins consider the first three steps as essential for inference and others are being superfluous. The Buddhists go a step further and think that only two steps viz. udāharaṇa and upanaya are essential. But Naiyāyikas think that all these five steps are necessary, if a man has to convince another to the truth of the inferential conclusion.

Other classification of inference is based on 'vyāpti'. Gangeśa mentions three kinds of inferences and this division was more popular in later times. According to the Nyāya concept there are two kinds of vyāpti viz. 'anvaya vyāpti' and 'vyatireka vyāpti'. 'Anvayavyāpti' is the invariable co-existence of the hetu with the sādhya i.e agreement in presence. For eg-in our typical example if there is smoke there is fire as in the kitchen. The second one is the invariable concomittence of the absence of the sādhya with the absence of the hetu, for eg. if there is the absence of fire there is the absence of smoke as in the lake[40].

The inference where the hetu pervades both positively and negatively is the 'anvayavyatireki'. In the previous example smoke is having both these relations so the inference of fire from smoke is 'anvaya-vyatireki'. Inference based only on the evidence of co-presence is 'kevalānvayi'. In this type of inference the hetu is universally present. In the example 'The pot is nameable as there exists knowability' (ghaṭaḥ abhidheyaḥ prameyatvāt), the sādhya and hetu are connected only positively as all things are nameable and knowable. Inference based on evidence of co-absence is 'kevalāvyatireki'. In this type of inference there exists only vyatirekavyāpti. The non existence of the sādhya pervades with the non existence of the hetu. For example in the inference 'Earth is different from other things as it has smell' '(pritvītarebhyo bhidyate gandhavatvāt)', the ground of inference is 'vyatireka vyāpti' i.e wherever the absence of the difference from other things (itarabhedābhāvaḥ) i.e absence of pritvitva exists there is the absence of smell (gandhavattvābhāva) as in the water.

Vyāpti - the nerve of Anumāna

Linga parāmarśa is considered to be the vyāpāra of inferential process and it is defined as "vyāpti viśiṣta pakṣadharmatā jñānam" i.e the knowledge of the pakṣadharmatā as qualified with vyāpti. So the

knowledge of pakṣadharmatā and vyāpti are the components of parāmarśa. Pakṣadharmatā is the knowledge that vyāpya exists in the pakṣa i.e. in the typical example, smoke - the vyāpya exists in the mountain[41]. This smoke (hetu) is qualified with a particular relation with fire (sādhya) and that relation is called the vyāpti or invariable concomitance.

Vyāpti - various views

Vātsyāyana in the Nyāyabhāṣya mentions two kinds of perception as the meaning of the term "tat pūrvaka". Among them the first kind is the perception of the relation between the linga and lingin and it is really referential to the vyāpti (invariable concomitance). This relation of linga and lingin is later termed as 'avinābhāva', 'niyama' or 'vyāpti'. Vācaspati misra and Udayana define 'avinābhāva' as an unconditional relation. (svābhāvika sambandha) i.e the relation free from any adventitious condition (upādhi). For instance the invariable co-existence of smoke with fire is not due to any adventitious condition. It is a natural one[42]. But fire co-exist with smoke only when there is an extra condition i.e the presence of wet fuel (ārdrendhana samyoga). By describing vyāpti as a natural relation the Naiyāyikas exclude the 'aupadhika sambandha'. Since the relation of smoke with fire is an invariable one, it can lead to valid

inferential cognition. So the relation between a hetu and sādhya need not necessarily be a mutual one. For instance the relation of fire with smoke cannot be regarded as a natural one but the same cannot be said about the relation of smoke with fire. The presence of smoke in the instances of fire requires the condition viz. the wet fuel. So this conditional relation is variable where as a natural one is not. Here the underlying fact is this - smoke is the product produced by fire. A cause can be inferred by the product. But the product cannot be inferred with the cause because the production of a product depends upon not only one cause but causes. Even though there is one cause, the production will not occur in the absence of other causes.

This kind of relation with a thing to a particular another thing is its nature and hence the question as to why not all are naturally related with all the other would not arise. This particular nature of a thing cannot be questioned as only certain things can be the causes of a particular effect.

Cārvāka view

The Cārvāka disprove the validity of inference and their main argument is that inference is imposible because it cannot establish any

invariable relation between the hetu and sādhya. Vyāpti is said to be ascertained, positively by the knowledge of co-existence (sahacāra) and negatively by the absence of knowledge of any contradictory instance for co-existence (vyabhicārāgraha). According to the Cārvākas it is not possible because there is always scope for doubts about the hetu as it can exist without sādhya. So one can not be absolutely sure that smoke can not exist without fire.

As a reply to Cārvākas, Nyāya view is that a real hetu (proban) must be free from any adventious condition. The absence of contradictory instance is also a pre requisite for inference and the vyāpti is ascertained only by ascertaining the relation of hetu and sādhya in many many examples and after clearing all the doubts. So there is no scope for the impossibility to inference.

Buddhist view

Buddhists are considered as the main opponent of Naiyāyikas in the ancient period. They approve the validity of 'anumāna' but there is difference of opinion regarding the concept of vyāpti. According to the Buddhist view the relation between hetu and sādhya which they termed as 'Avinābhāva sambandha' can hold good only between that which are

identical (tādātmya) or cause and effects (tadutpatti)[43].

If the hetu and sādhya are identical, one can be sure that the hetu can never be found without the sādhya. For eg - the inference that 'it is a tree because it is an aśoka' (ayam vṛkṣaḥ simśapātvāt). 'Tādātmya' (essential identity) is a relation of genus and species and thus we know that all 'aśokas' are trees. Then we infer that this is a tree such as it is an 'aśōka'. 'Aśoka' and tree are related to each other as genus and species. The coinherence of the generic qualities of a tree with the specific characteristics of an 'aśoka' tree may be viewed as relation to essential identity. The relation of 'tadutpatti' is that of uniformity, of cause and effect. If the two are cause and effect, they too can be surely said as invariably associated with each other. For eg. in the case of smoke and fire. As fire is the cause of smoke, smoke cannot exist without fire. Thus only that relation of hetu and sādhya which is ascertained on the ground that they are identical or cause and effects, can be useful in the process of inference[44]. Vācaspati misra rejects this contention of the Buddhists on the ground that tādātmya is of no use in ascertaining the avinābhāva sambandha between a hetu and sādhya for what is to be proved and the proof can never be identical. Vṛkṣatva and simśapātva which are usually mentioned by the Buddhists as the instance of hetu

and sādhya being identical are in fact not identical. If these two generic attributes were identical the words conveying them should have been synonyms[45]. If the inference that it is a tree because it is an 'aśoka' is due to the essential identity of tree and 'aśoka' then the opposite argument that it s an 'aśoka' because it is a tree ought to be valid as well. For if it was a case of identity it ought to be the same in both ways. If the answer to this - It is that characteristic of an 'aśōka' tree to associate with those of a tree and not those of a tree with 'aśoka', then certainly the agreement is not due to essential identity, but by invariable association of 'linga' with the 'lingin' or by 'niyama'.

'Tadutpatti' also is of no use in ascertaining the 'avinābhāva sambandha' between hetu and sādhya on the ground that it is impossible to come to a conclusion that a particular thing is the product of another thing because it follows the latter. For instance smoke cannot be determined as a product of fire as smoke follows the fire. In that case, it will have to be regarded as a product of donkey also, for in many instances its occurrence is found to be following a donkey. There may be this answer that the smoke does not invariably follow the donkey and so it cannot be considered as the product of donkey then there is scope for another doubt that one may entertain a doubt that though the occurrence

of smoke is found invariably following fire, it may be due to a ghost which is present in all the instances of fire. Thus in some remote places also the same ghost might have caused the smoke. Until and unless such a doubt is cleared it cannot be determined that the smoke is a product of fire. Therefore the 'tadutpatti' is not considered as the cause for ascertaining Vyāpti[46].

Further the Naiyāyikas point out that there are innumerable instances of inference in which the hetu and sādhya are not related either by the relation of identity or that of cause and effect, still they are universally accepted as holding the "avinābhāva sambandha". Thus a non effect and a non identical object also can be employed as hetu and sādhya and a valid inferential cogtnition can be obtained. Hence they are of opinion that it is not necessary to restrict the invariable relation only between the cause and effect or identical objects.

According to the ancient Naiyāyikas, vyāpti is the 'svābhāvika sambandha' - a natural relation. But vyāpti is not a reciprocal relation. It is a property that resides in the cause (hetu) so there is vyāpti in smoke regarding the fire. When fire becomes a cause in establishing the existence of smoke there isn't vyāpti in fire, as fire exists even in places where there is not smoke. So the definition of vyāpti 'Svābhāvika

sambandha' is not accepted by later Naiyāyikas.

Navya Nyāya view

The earlier Naiyāyikas have mainly concentrated their arguments to refute the Buddhist stand which restricted the relation of vyāpti to only such things which are cause and effect or identical. They have also made it clear that vyāpti is a sort of natural relation but they have not discussed this issue in detail as to which exactly is that relation. That credit goes to the great Gangeśopādhyāya who discussed this issue in detail and formulated a definition of Vyāpti which is regarded as final. From the content of Tattvacintāmaṇi it is evident that even before Gangeśa some other Naiyāyikas had discussed and formulated some definitions of Vyāpti. However we do not know, who were the advocates of those definitions. Gangeśa mentions these earlier views and finally refute them on the ground that they are not applicable to such inferences in which the sādhya is universally present.

View of Gangeśa

Gangeśopādhyāya begins the examination of vyāpti by discussing whether vyāpti can be described as 'avyabhicaritatva' i.e absence of inconsistency. Gangeśa first presents a set of five definitions slightly

differing one another which is known as vyāptipancakam as the meaning of 'avyabhicaritatva'[47].

Vyāptipancakam (Five provisional definitions of invariable concomitance)

Gangeśa presents a set of five definitions for vyāpti in the form of 'avyabhicaritatva' which may be prevalent at Gangeśa's period. The commentators of Tattvacintāmaṇi before Raghunātha śiromaṇi have not cared much to interpret these definitions. But Raghunātha discusses the definitions in detail and is of opinion that the five definitions among which each succeeding one seems an improvement over the precedng one and the defects pointed out in the preceding one can be solved by the succeeding definitions.

The first definition for Vyāpti given in the Pancalakṣaṇi is 'sādhyābhāvavatavrittitvam' i.e the non existence (of hetu) in a locus in which the sādhya does not exists. The vyāpti is the property of hetu[48] and the application should be done in the hetu. In our typical example of inference viz. - 'The mountain possesses fire as it possesssmoke', the smoke is the hetu and fire is the sādhya. The sādhyābhāva is the absence of fire and sādhyābhāvavat - the locus where sādhya does not exist is

the lake etc, the fish moss etc exist there and the hetu i.e smoke does not exist (avṛttitvam). So there is vyāpti between smoke and fire. This definition is not having overpervasion (ativyāpti) in the vyabhicāri hetu. For instance in the inference that "The mountain possesses smoke as it possesses fire" - the smoke is the sādhya sādhyābhāvavat,is the redhot iron ball (taptāyogolaka) and the hetu fire existsin this iron ball.

But a problem has been raised with regard to this definition. The defect is that it does not include cases of incomplete occurrence (avyāpyavṛitti). The example given to it is that 'This tree is in contact with the monkey for there is treeness' (kapisamyogi etad vṛkṣatvād). According to Nyāya concept conjunction (samyoga) is a quality and it is of incomplete occurrence (avyāpya vṛtti). Hence the tree can be considered as the locus of conjunction (sādhya) as the branches are concerned, but at the same time the tree can turn out to be a locus of the absence of contact when the root is taken into consideration. In the example shown above, the sādhya is 'kapisamyoga' and the root of the tree is sadhyābhāvavat, but treeness the hetu exists there, so there is 'avyāpti'.

Because of the inapplicability of the first definition in such valid cases of inferences the second definition is introduced and the defect is

solved[49]. The second definition is that "Sādhyavad bhinna sādhyābhāvavadavrittitvam" i.e non existence (of hetu) in the locus of the absence of sādhya and which (locus) differs from that which is the possessor of the sādhya. Jagadiśa the commentator of Dīdhiti says; in that definition the term 'sādhyavadbhinna vṛttitva' is added as the qualifier to the 'sādhyābhāva' to include the inferences of incomplete occurrence[50]. According to this definition the proban should not occur in the locus of such an absence of 'sādhya' in which 'sādhya' and 'sādhyābhāva' occur. in the example 'This tree possesses the contact of the monkey because this tree possesses treeness', the hetu treeness occur in the downward portion where there is not contact of the monkey. In other words, on the consideration of 'sādhyābhāva' only such 'sādhyābhāva' should be considered, where the locus of 'sādhya' and 'sādhyābhāva' are different. So in the example although the hetu 'edat vṛkṣatva' (this treeness) occurs in the locus of the absence of 'sādhya' i.e in the root but such absence is not one that subsist in a locus different from the locus of the 'sādhya' i.e the 'sādhya' and its absence exists in the same tree.

The application of the definition is like this. The substratum of the sadhya viz. the kapisamyoga is the tree, the substratum different from the tree is, quality etc. Samyoga is a quality and it cannot reside in

another quality. A monkey cannot have contact in the quality and the hetu 'etat vṛkṣatva' does not exists in this quality. Hence there is invariable concomitance for the treeness with the contact of the monkey. The difference of locus makes the negation different. So we have to uphold the theory that the absence differes in different locuses ie the absence of conjunction in quality, in substance and in action are all separate and different[51].

But Raghunātha remarks that there is no evidence to approve that the absences differ according to their substratum because that view is not unanimonsly accepted. Some are of opinion that a negation which is partially present in a substratum, and completely in another differes, so there is no proof to approve that the absence of conjunction existing in the guṇa and karma is different from that exists in dravya[52]. The 'saṁyogābhāva' which is existing in guṇa exists in the dravya also. Jagadīśa points out avyāpti in another inferences like saṁyogi dravyatvāt and in the inference 'ghaṭatva ghaṭākāśa saṁyogānyataratvābhāvavān gaganatvāt'[53]. Moreover the object of the second definition is to the make the definition applicable to such cases of inference where the 'sādhya' is of incomplete occurrence and this could well serve in such purpose without the term 'sādhyābhāva'. So the term 'sādhyābhāva' is superfluous.

Hence the second definition is rejected and there is necessity for introducing the third definition i.e 'Sādhyavat pratiyogikānyonyābhāva-samānādhikaraṇyam'. Vyāpti is not having a common locus with a mutual absence which has the locus of the sādhya as its counterpositive. In the inference the mountain possesses fire as it possesses smoke, sādhya is fire and 'sādhyavat pratiyogikānyonyābhāva' i.e difference from fire - possessor and the 'adhikaraṇa' of this difference is the lake etc, fish noss etc exist in it; and there is no existence of smoke. But this definition does not apply to an inference whose sādhya exists in different substratums. In the aforesaid example the sādhya fire exists in different substratum like the hill, kitchen, yard etc. Taking kitchen to be the substratum of sādhya its reciprocal negation exists on the hill on which smoke is present[54]. So Raghunātha is of opinion that the fourth definition is formulated that it may be applicable to an inference whose sādhya exists in plurality of substrata. The fourth definition is 'Sakala sādhyābhāvavanniṣṭhābhāvapratiyogitvam' i.e hetu being the counter positive of the absence which resides in the substratums of the absences of all sādhya. It can be applied to the inferences in which the sādhya has plurality of substrata. For instance in the inference 'It has fire as it has smoke' - the sādhya is fire. All the substrata of the non existence of fire are all the objects like lake pond etc. The negation characterising all is

the negation of smoke, as smoke does not exist in any substratum of the negation of fire. So the smoke is the counterpositive of the absence.

Raghunātha here brings into consideration all individual instances in their entirety and considers them individually. The term sakala (totality) is to be understood with regard to both the sādhyābhāvavat, and sādhya (the locus of the absence of sādhya and of the sādhya)[55]. The reason why Raghunātha takes all loci of the absence of the sādhya into consideration is to be found in the fact that otherwise the definition would be too wide as to pervade in a false reasoning. For instance in the invalid inference "It possesses smoke because it possesses fire". The lake can easily be considered as one of the locus of the absence of smoke (sādhyābhāvavat) where there is absence of fire, so fire would be the counter positive of the absence that occurs in a locus of the absence of sādhya. So all (sakala) instances of the absence of sādhya should be reviewed. Hence the red rot iron ball can be taken as the locus where in the sādhya ie smoke is absent, and fire occurs in such a locus. Hence fire cannot be considered as the counterpositive. The term sākalya should also be understood as qualifying the sādhya, otherwise the defintion would be too narrow in cases of valid inference i.e where fire is to be inferred from smoke. Snice one can take any positive instance (sapakṣa)

into account and that kitchen fire is absent in the mountain, yard fire is absent in the kitchen. In this way each and every positive instances would turn out to be locus of the absence of sādhya where the hetu exists. So there occur 'avyāpti'. On the other hand if we take all the positive instances in their entirety without any specification, all positive instances are excluded. So they cannot be taken as the locus of the absence of probandum and negative instances like lake could be considered and the hetu does not exist there.

In order to make this definition more precise emphasis has been laid on the character of totality. Totality has been defined in terms of variety and non remainder among many (anekāśeṣa). If this device of defining totality is accepted the definition would not apply to such cases where one unitary object is to be inferred. For instance in the valid inference it is of this (particular) colour as it possesses this particular taste (edat rūpavān edat rasāt). Here the inference refers to only the single instance of colour of which no concept of totality can be constructed and such the definition turns out to be defective. Other defects pointed out by Raghunātha is that it does not apply in inference "It has the absence of this jarhood, as it is a cloth" (ghatatvabhāvavān patatvāt) and in a valid inference "This is pervaded by the absence of smoke since (there

is) the absence or fire" (nirdhūmatva vyāpyavān nirvahnitvāt)[56].

Hence the fifth definition is formulated, the definition is "Sādhyavadanyāvrittitvam" i.e vyāpti is non occurrence of the hetu in a locus other than that the sādhya possesses. Raghunātha is of opinion that the counterpositive of the mutual absence should be admitted by the generic attribute of being the locus of sādhya (sādhyavatvāvacchinna) i.e mutual negation which forms a part of the definition should be understood with regard to all loci of the sādhya. So this definition means we have vyāpti between hetu and sādhya when the hetu does not exist in whatever is other than an instance of sādhya. In the typical example the mountain possesses fire as it possesses smoke. The 'sādhya' is fire and 'sādhyavat' is kitchen etc, 'sādhyāvadanya' is the lake etc, where smoke does not exist. So there is vyāpti between the smoke and fire.

The vyāpti in the form of 'avyabhicaritatva' is defined in five ways by Gangeśa and they are not accepted as a faultless because they cannot be applied to the kevalānvayi type of hetu. If we take the inference "It is nameable as it is knowable" (abhidheyaḥ prameyatvāt) the sādhya, nameable is kevalānvayi because it is not to be found absent anywhere.

The first definition can not apply in the abovesaid example

because the locus of the absence of sādhya which is determined by the relation and essence determing it is not available. The second definition is also not applicable because substratum different from that of the sādhya is absurd as the sādhya is universally present. According to third definition non existence of the reciprocal negation of the substratum of the sādhya with the hetu is desired. But the difference from or reciprocal absence of the substratum of the sādhya does not arise as namability being completely pervasive. The fourth definition does not apply in the inference because the substratum of the negation of the sādhya is absurd in the inference whose sādhya is universally present. The fifth definition requires the difference from the substratum of the sādhya and such does not apply in the inference, it is namable as it is knowable. Hence Gangeśa has refuted these five definitions which take the negation of unconsistency (avyabhicaritatva) to be the essence of vyāpti.

Then Gangeśa rejects two more definitions of vyāpti. The first is known as the lion vyāpti (simha lakṣaṇa). According to it vyāpti is a condition of hetu not residing in the locus which is the locus of the non existing of sādhya. In the inference "It has fire as it has smoke" water is not the substratum of the sādhya fire and the hetu smoke does not reside in the substratum viz. water. Hence smoke is the invariable concomitant of fire.

Second definition is known as tiger (vyāgrah) lakṣaṇa. The definition is that vyāpti of the hetu as a condition of inference is, the hetu not being the locus of anything possessing the character of being "bhinnādhikaraṇa with the sādhya" (sādhya vyadhikaraṇyanadhikaraṇatvam) i.e. not having a locus which is non locus of sādhya. For instance water is not the locus (of smoke) which is not the substratum of fire and smoke. Hence smoke is the invariable concomitant of fire. Gangeśa does not find any difference between the two and according to him the definitions can ultimately reduced to one ie not being present in a substratum which is not the substratum of sādhya[57]. Gangeśa refuts them by the same reason that they cannot be applcable in the kevalānvayi type of inference is concerned. In Nyāya ontology all real entities are knowable and nameable. So non occurrence of knowability would be unexampled (aprasiddha) since it has nothing to characterise and an instance which is not the locus of sādhya is something unknown. Hence the concept of 'avyabhicaritatva' and the various definitions for the same, offered so far consists necessarily of the negation or difference of sādhya in their body is not applicable to such inferences.

Caturdaśalakṣaṇī

To solve the problem raised above saundadopādhyāya a pre

Gangeśa Naiyāyika introduced a new concept in the definition of vyāpti. Karl. H. Potter says that "According to D.C. Bhaṭṭācarya this sondada was regarded in his time as the supreme leader of the social hierarchy in Mithula. He lived slightly prior to Gangeśa who refers him in many places. Thus we may date him in the early fourteeth century"[58]. His best contribution is a novel view about an additional kind of absence, one whose counterpositive is determined by an essence pertainng to a different substratum i.e 'vyadhikaraṇadharmāvacchinna pratiyogitākābhāva'. The expression "There is no fire possessing the nature of a pot" signifies that there is non existence of fire as qualified by the nature of a pot which according to him is quite correct in as much as the essence of pot abides through the relation of inherence in a pot not in the fire. Similarly "There is no nameableness possessing the essence of a pot" signifies that there is non existence of nameableness qualified by the nature of a pot.

Hence the absence of sādhya can be postulated in the kevalānvayi form of inference. Though nameability and knowability exist in everything including a pot, it does not exist in it through the relation of samavāya. So the negation of sādhya i.e vācyatvābhāva could be introduced. Raghunāthaśiromaṇi remarks that it is an experience which take place

to all, that the cloth is not existing in the nature of pot and that experience cannot be rejected even by the "Girvāṇaguru"[59]. The portion of Tattvacintāmaṇi dealing with the above theory of Saundaḍopādhyāya and its refutation by Gaṅgeśa is traditionally known as 'Vyadhikaraṇa-dharmāvacchinnābhāva prakaraṇa'. Gaṅgeśa examines the views of saundaḍopādhyāya and rejects it. He is of opinion that the 'vācyatvābhāva' could of course be considered as existing in the manner mentioned above, but then in the same pot having this vācyatvābhāva does exist the hetu viz. 'jñeyatva'. So the very concept of 'avyabhicaritatva' as a form of vyāpti is defective. Hence with regard to the vyāpti, only the regular negation and not 'vyadhikaraṇadharmāvacchinnābhāva' can be thought of since the regular negation of vācyatva is not existent,the concept of vyāpti as 'avyabhicaritatva' cannot be accepted.

However Raghunātha śiromaṇi the most celebrated commentator of Gaṅgeśa's Tattvacintāmaṇi goes against the view and speaks of its existence. He offers in his 'Dīdhiti' two such definitions by himself and quotes twelve more definitions by other writers. This set of fourteen definitions of the conventional "avyabhicaritatva" is known as caturdaśa lakṣaṇi[60].

The definitions given by Ragunātha śiromaṇi is known as prathama

svalaksaṇa and dvitīya svalakṣaṇa. The other three definitions are of Cakravarti, two of Pragalbha, one by Viśārada, three by Misra, then two definitions known as 'Kūṭāghatita' and 'Kūtaghatita' and the last one is known as 'Puccalakṣaṇa'. The advocates of this kind of abhāva had used all their skill to formulate a perfect definition of vyāpti incorporating that concept - 'Vyadhikaraṇadharmāvacchinnābhāva'. In the next section of Tattvacintāmaṇi known as pūrvapakṣa - Prakaraṇa Gangeśa critically examines and refuts the earlier definitions of vyāpti and he gives his own definition known as Siddhānta lakṣaṇa[61].

The text Nacaratnamālikā

The Nacaratnamālikā of Śāstṛśarman discusses the second definition of vyāpti given by Pragalbhācārya. The text is published from Vāraṇaseeya Samskṛta Viśwavidhyālaya in 1965 by the Vice Chancellor, Surati Nārāyaṇa Maṇi Tripāti. This includes the commentary of the author known as 'Nūtanāloka' and sub commentary by the author's disciples, known as 'Aloka prakāśa'. But the original text is not available now. Two paper manuscripts of the commentary is available with Dr. Bhārati - daughter of T. Rāmawarrier - the devoted disciple of Śāstṛśarman.

References:

1. vide. Cadurdaśalakṣaṇi - Dīdhiti with Gādadhari, Adayar Library and Research Centre, Madras, 1986, p-281
2. NS, 1.1.4
3. HIL, P.47
4. NS, 1.1.1
5. NB, opening lines
6. *चतसृषु चैवंविधास्वर्थतत्वं परिसमाप्यते* Ibid, p-3
7. HIL, p-357
8. vide *उपलब्धिसाधनानि प्रमाणनीति समाख्यानिर्वचन सामर्थ्याद् बोद्धव्यम्, प्रमीयतेऽनेनेति करणार्थाभिधानो हि प्रमाणशब्दः तद्विशेषसमाख्याया अपि तथैव व्याख्यातम्* NB, p-18
9. *बुद्धिरुपलब्धिज्ञानमित्यनर्थान्तरम्* NS, 1.1.15
10. *सतस्य सत्भावः असतश्चासत्भावः, सत् सत् इति गृह्यमाणं यथाभूतमविपरीतं तत्वं भवति असत् असत् इति गृह्यमाणं यथाभूतमविपरीतं तत्वं भवति* NB, p-18
11. *तद्वति तत्प्रकारकोऽनुभवो यथार्थानुभवः तदभाववति तत्प्रकारकोऽनुभव अयथार्थानुभवः* Tarkasangraha, p.p.-20-21
12. vide. Avayava of Gangeśopādhyāya, p-5
13. vide. *अव्यभिचारिणीमसन्दिग्धामर्थोपलब्धिं विदधतो बोधाबोधस्वभावसामग्री करणम्* Nyayamañjari of Jayanta part I, p-31
14. vide. Ibid, p-31

15. Vaiśeṣika sūtra, 9.2.12

16. *प्रमाकरणमेवात्र प्रमाणं तर्कमक्षवत् प्रमाचाज्ञाततत्वार्थज्ञानमेवात्र भिद्यते, तत्वपदेन भ्रमसंशयादीनामयथार्थानां निरासः* Mānameyodaya, p.p - 2-5

17. *उभयथा दर्शनम्* NB, p-18

18. NS, 2.2.2

19. NS, 1.1.5

20. vide. History of Indian Philosophy - Dasgupta, p-343

21. *अनुमितिचरमकारणलिङ्गपरामर्शप्रयोजक शाब्दज्ञान जनकवाक्यं न्यायः* Avayava, p-5

22. vide. *प्रमाणैरर्थपरीक्षणं न्यायः* NB. p-6

23. Ibid, p-61

24. vide. *प्रत्यक्षागमाभ्यामीक्षितस्य अन्वीक्षणमान्वीक्षा, तया प्रवर्ततेत्यान्वीक्षिकी न्यायविधा न्यायशास्त्रम्* Ibid, p-6

25. *सद्विषयं च प्रत्यक्षं सदसत् विषयकं चानुमानम्, कस्मात् त्रैकाल्यग्रहणात्* Ibid, p-26

26. *अपि चानुमानाप्रामाण्ये प्रत्यक्षस्याप्यप्रमाण्यापत्तेः प्रामाण्यस्यानुमेयत्वात्* TC Part II, p-24

27. vide. *तत्पूर्वकमित्यनेन लिङ्गलिङ्गिनोः सम्बन्धदर्शनम् लिङ्गदर्शनं चाभिसंबध्यते* NB, p-24

28. vide. *तानि ते तत् पूर्वं यस्य तदिदं तत्पूर्वकम् यदा तानीति विग्रहः तदा समस्तप्रमाणाभिसम्बन्धात् सर्वप्रमाणपूर्वकत्वमनुमानस्य वर्णितं भवति* NV, p-43

29. vide. *तत्र व्याप्तिविशिष्टपक्षधर्मता ज्ञानजन्यं ज्ञानमनुमितिस्तत्करणमनुमानम् तच्चलिङ्गपरामर्शं नतु परामृश्यमाणं लिङ्गमिति विवक्ष्यते* TC Part II, p-2

30. *मितेन लिङ्गेन पश्चात्मानमनुमानम्* NB, p-18

31. NV of Udyotakara, p-44

32. vide. *ज्ञायमानं लिङ्गं तु क रणं नहि अनागतादौ लिङ्गेन न स्यादनुमितिस्तथा* NSM Part II, karika 67

33. *व्यापारस्तु परामर्श करणम् व्याप्तिधी भवेत्* Ibid, karika 66

34. Ibid, p.p. - 25-26

35. *त्रिविधमिति अन्वयी व्यतिरेकी अन्वयव्यतिरेकी चेति* NV, p-46

36. vide. *अथवा त्रिविधमिति नियमार्थम् अनेकधा भिन्नस्यानुमानस्य त्रिविधेन पूर्ववदादिना संग्रह इति नियमं दर्शयति* NV, p-49

37. Praśastapāda bhāṣya, p - 508

38. *तेन च चरमपरामर्श उत्पाद्यत इति न्यायजन्यज्ञानस्यपरामर्शप्रयोजकता* Avayava, p-12

39. Mānameyodaya kārika, 53-54

40. vide. *हेतुसाध्ययोर्व्याप्तिरन्वयव्याप्तिः तदभावयोर्व्याप्तिव्यतिरेकव्याप्ति* Tarkasangraha, p-32

41. Ibid, p-29

42. vide. *तस्माद्यो वा सा वाऽस्तुसम्बन्धः केवलं यस्यासौ स्वाभाविको नियतो स एव गमको गम्यश्चेतरः सम्बन्धीति युज्यते तथा हि धूमादीनां वह्न्यादि सम्बन्धः स्वाभाविकः नतु वह्न्यादीनां धूमादिभिः* NVTT, p-165

43. *कार्यकारणभावाद्वा स्वभावाद्वा नियमकात्। अविनाभावनियमोऽदर्शनान्न न दर्शनात्* Quoted in NVTT, p-159

44. *केचिदविनाभावं तादात्म्यतदुत्पत्तिनिबन्धनमनुमानाङ्गमाहुः* NVTT, p-158

45. *अपि च तादात्म्ये कथं गम्यगमकभावः तस्य भेदाश्रयत्वात् नहि तदेव कर्म कतृ चेति युक्तम् तस्य भेदाश्रयत्वात्, शब्दानाञ्च पर्यायत्वप्रसङ्गात्* NVTT, p-163

46. *सत्यम्रो पिशाचेन जनितो धूम क्वचित् देशादौ तज्जातीय एव रासभवत् वह्न्यभावेऽपि पिशाचादेव भविष्यतीत्यवश्यं शङ्कया भाव्यं नियामकमपश्यताम्* Ibid, p-160

47. अनुमिति हेतुभूत व्याप्तिज्ञाने का व्याप्तिः, न तावदव्यभिचारितत्वम् तद्धि न साध्याभाववदवृत्तित्वम्, साध्यवद्भिन्न साध्याभाववदवृत्तित्वम्, साध्यवत्प्रतियोगिकान्योन्याभावासामानाधिकरण्यम्, सकलसाध्याभाववन्निष्ठाभावप्रतियोगित्वम्, साध्यवदन्यावृत्तित्वम् वा केवलान्वयिन्यभावात् TC Part II, p.p. 27-31

48. vide. व्याप्यो नाम व्याप्त्याश्रयः NSM Part II, p-216

49. साध्याभाववदवृत्तित्वस्याव्याप्यवृत्ति साध्यक सत्हेतावव्याप्तिमाशङ्क्याह - साध्यवद्भिन्नेति Vyāptipañcakam - Didhiti, p-50

50. साध्याभावे साध्यवत्भिन्नवृत्तित्वविशेषणस्त्वव्याप्यवृत्ति साध्यक संग्रहार्थमेव, Jagadisi on Vyāptipañcakam, p-54

51. न च कपिसंयोग्येतद्वृक्षत्वादित्यादेः सङ्ग्रहार्थमधिकरणभेदेनाऽभाव भेदमादृत्यैव लक्षणमिदं कार्यम् - Ibid, p-54

52. कर्मादौ संयोगाद्यभावस्य भिन्नत्वे मानाभावादाह Ibid, p.56

53. Ibid, p -56

54. हेतोः साध्यवत्पक्षभिन्न दृष्टान्तवृत्तित्वेनाव्याप्तेः Ibid, p -57

55. vide. साकल्यं साध्याभाववति साध्ये च बोध्यम् Ibid, p-59

56. vide. यत्रैकव्यक्तिकंसाध्यं विपक्षो वा तत्र निर्धूमत्वादिव्याप्ये तत्वेन साध्ये विर्वह्नित्वादौ चाव्याप्तिस्तत्र हेत्वभावस्य वह्न्यादेः प्रत्येकं यावद्विपक्षावृत्तित्वात् Ibid, p-72

57. vide. नापि साध्यसामानाधिकरण्यानधिकरणत्वं, साध्यवैय्यधिकरणानाधिकरणत्वम् वा तदुभयमपि साध्यानधिकरणानधिकरणत्वम् - TC Part II, p.p. 49-50

58. vide. Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophy vol. II, p-668

59. यदि पुनरानुभाविको लोकानां स्वरसवाहि घटत्वेन पटो नास्तीत्यादि प्रत्ययो न तदा तादृशाभावनिवारणं गीर्वाणगुरूणामपि शक्यमिति मन्तव्यम् Gadādhari commentary on Didhiti, p-250

60. The set of fourteen definitions of the avyabhicaritatva (caturdaśalakṣaṇi) are given below.

1. *प्रथमस्वलक्षणम् - यत्समानाधिकरणाः साध्यतावच्छेदकावच्छिन्नव्यापकतावच्छेदक-प्रतियोगिताका यावन्तोऽभावाः प्रतियोगिसमानाधिकरणाः तत्वम्*

2. *द्वितीयस्वलक्षणम् - यत्समानाधिकरणानां साध्यतावच्छेदकावच्छिन्नव्यापकतावच्छेदक रुपावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताकानां यावताम् अभावानां प्रतियोगितावच्छेदका-वच्छिन्नसामानाधिकरण्यम् तत्वम्।*

3. *चक्रवर्तिलक्षणम् - (१) व्याप्यवृत्तेः हेतुसमानाधिकरणस्य साध्याभावस्य प्रतियोगितायाम् अनवच्छेदकं यत् साध्यतावच्छेदकं तदवच्छिन्नसामानाधिकरण्यम्*

4. *चक्रवर्तिलक्षणम् (२) हेतुसमानाधिकरणस्य व्याप्यवृत्तेः अभावस्य प्रतियोगितायां सामानाधिकरण्येन अनवच्छेदकं यत्साध्यतावच्छेदकं तदवच्छिन्न सामानाधिकरण्यम्*

5. *चक्रवर्तिलक्षणम् (३) हेतुसमानाधिकरणस्य प्रतियोगिव्यधिकरणस्य अभावस्य प्रतियोगितायां सामानाधिकरण्येन अनवच्छेदकं यत् साध्यतावच्छेदकं तदवच्छिन्न सामानाधिकरण्यम्।*

6. *प्रगल्भलक्षणम् (१) साध्यतावच्छेदकविशिष्टसाध्य सामानाधिकरण्यावच्छेदक स्वसमानाधिकरण साध्याभावत्वकत्वम्।*

7. *प्रगल्भलक्षणम् (२) यत्समानाधिकरणसाध्याभावप्रमायां साध्यवत्ताज्ञानप्रतिबन्धकत्वं नास्ति तत्वम्*

8. *विशारदलक्षणम् - साध्याभाववति यद्वृत्तौ प्रकृतानुमितिविरोधितं नास्ति तत्वम्।*

9. *मिश्रलक्षणम् (१) यावन्तः साध्याभावाः व्याप्यवृत्तयः प्रत्येकं तत्तत्सजातीया ये तत्तदाधिकरणवृत्तित्वाभावाः तद्वत्वम्*

10. *मिश्रलक्षणम् (२) यावन्तो व्याप्यवृत्तयः साध्याभावाः प्रत्येकं तेषां सजातीयस्य व्यापकीभूतस्य व्याप्यवृत्तेरभावस्य प्रतियोगितावच्छेदकेन धर्मेण यद्रूपावच्छिन्नं प्रति व्यापकत्वम् अवच्छिद्यते तद्रूपकत्वम्*

11. *मिश्रलक्षणम् (३) यावन्तः साध्यतावच्छेदकावच्छिन्नव्यापकतावच्छेदक-रूपावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताकाः साध्याभावाः प्रत्येकं तत्प्रतियोगितावच्छेदकेन यद्रूपावच्छिन्नं प्रति व्यापकत्वमवच्छिद्यते तद्रूपवत्वम्।*

12. *कूटाघटितलक्षणम् - वृत्तिमद्वृत्तयो यावन्तः साध्याभाववद्वृत्तित्वाभावाः तद्वत्वम्*

13. *कूटघटितलक्षणम् - वृत्तिमद्वृत्तयो यावन्तः साध्याभाव समुदायाधिकरण वृत्तित्वाभावाः तद्वत्वम्।*

14. *पुच्छलक्षणम् - साध्यतावच्छेदकावच्छिन्न व्यापकतावच्छेदक रूपावच्छिन्न प्रतियोगिताक व्याप्यवृत्ति स्वसमानाधिकरण यावदभावाधिकरणवृत्तित्वाभावा यावन्तो वृत्तिमद्वृत्यः तद्वत्वम्।*

Caturdaśalakṣaṇī Dīdhiti with Gādādhari - Edited from Adayar Library and Research Centre Madras - 1986, p.p XI - XIII

61. *प्रतियोग्यसमानाधिकरण यत्समानाधिकरणात्यन्ताभावप्रतियोगितावच्छेदकावच्छिन्नं यन्न भवति तेन समं तस्य सामानाधिकरण्यम् (व्याप्तिः)* Ibid, p. XIII

CHAPTER III
CHARACTERISTICS OF NACARATNAMĀLIKĀ

The very title "Nacaratnamālikā" suggests the characteristic features of this book because the first part of the title 'Naca' denotes that it is a blend of 'Pūrvapakṣa' and 'Uttarapakṣa'. This is a book which contains sentences with 'Naca'. The words like 'Naca', 'Nanu' and 'Yattu' are generally used in the śāstra works to denote the opponent's view, where there are various opinions about a subject. 'Naca' is a very popular term used in the Nyāya works in the beginning of a sentence, followed vācyam at the last to mention that it is a pūrvapakṣa and that the author cannot agree with it.

In the NRM the 'Naca's are considered as jewels (ratna). Ratna is a precious object and this term is used to denote the most precious ones from a category, just as 'puruṣaratna', 'strīratna' etc. Another characteristic feature of the ratna is its shining property which will last for ever. Mālikā means mālā (garland) itself. So it is a garland of jewels in the form of Nacas[1].

The jewels of 'Naca' which continues as a series form the content of the text. In the first āvalī (row) there are nineteen gems. The next row

is longer than the first, containing twenty five 'Naca-s' and the last 'āvalī' is the longest containing fifty four jewels of Naca-s. Thus totally ninety-eight Naca-s are included in the text in three chapters named āvalī-s. So it is clear that the treatment of subject followed in this book is in the style of arguments and counter-arguments. The interpretation in NRM starts with three alternate meanings for a term and the three meanings are rejected pointing out defects. This style continues upto the end of the work. After giving arguments as contradictory or complimentary to the pūrvapakṣa, the author's opinion of each of the topic is given at the end of the discussion. This way of treatment is seen in scholastic dissertaion and in śāstra works and those type of works are called 'kroḍa patra-s'.

I. Nacaratnamālikā - A kroḍa patra.

Among the large number of works connected Nyāya śāstra written during eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, we come across two types of works viz. Vāda-s and Kroḍapatra-s. They contributed much in the development of Nyāya school. Between the two, the vāda-s are treatises which aim at upholding the Nyāya view of a concept through a thorough discussion of the same. It seems that Raghunātha Śiromaṇi (16th Centuary A.D.) is the pioneer who composed these types of treatises and he composed many such works like Ākhyātavāda and Nañvāda[2].

Later Gadādhara Bhaṭṭācarya and others continued to write such treatises[3] Gadādhara Bhaṭṭācarya's Vyutpattivāda, Viṣayatāvāda and Pramaṇṇyavāda are very popular among the vāda granthas.

The Kroḍapatra-s are slightly different from the vādas. They are written to explain certain sentences that occur in the original text. They are not considered to be commentaries because they do not continue to explain each and every sentences of the original text. The authors of kroḍa patras pick up only *certain points and* discuss it thoroughly. So the kroḍa *patras* deserve to be treated as independent works of the authors. The Kroḍapatra-s starts with the sentences of the original text but then no where explains or comments on any other part of the text and never tries to summarize the points made in the text. The works starts with raising objection and further goes on rejecting any modification or clarification by pointing out loopholes in it. When it reaches to a certain stage beyond which no further objection is possible; the author comes out with his own solutions. Two Kroḍapatra-s to mention here are the Kālīśankarīya of Kālīśankara Bhaṭṭācarya and Candranārāyaṇīya of Candranārayaṇa Bhaṭṭācārya who flourished during18th century A.D. These two kroḍapatra-s are held in high esteem in Nyāya circle. These two kroḍapatra-s are on Hetvābhāsa sāmanyanirukti of Gadādhara

Bhaṭṭacārya which in its turn is a commentary on Raghunātha Śiromani's Dīdhiti on the Hetvābhāsa Prakaraṇa of Gaṅgeśa's Tattvacintāmaṇi[4].

The terms 'kroḍa' and 'patra' literally signifies that 'kroḍa' means middle and 'patra' means a letter or an article, analytical in nature. Thus 'Kroḍapatra' is an article or a collection of articles written with a critical perspective that aims at discussing a point which occurs in the original text. 'NRM' is a treatise with a critical perspective that aims at discussing the definition of vyāpti, which occurs in the anumāna portion of Tattvacintāmaṇi - the original text and it clearly follows all the characteristics of a 'Kroḍapatra'.

Another explanation given to the term 'Kroḍa patra' is that it is a paper kept in between pages. While copying the manuscripts, sometimes the copyist may miss some sentences and in such cases it becomes necessary to offer some explanations for that portions. Sometimes some scholars may write something to express their own views on certain points discussed in the text.

The NRM seems to be the outcome of the intellectual excercises of Śāstrśarman which continued for several years. The Participation in the 'Śāstrasadas' and acquaintance with the eminent scholars like

Setumādhavadeeksitar, PRV etc enriched his sharp and shrewed intelligence. So he may have noted something in mind to add in the 'Pragalbhalakṣaṇa' of vyāpti during the discussion. PRV in his Bhūmika of the NRM mentions that the author had a sharp and superb intelligence that made him efficient to sport even with the tough 'kroḍapatṛa-s'[5]. He also remarks that the acquaintance with Setumādhavadeekṣitar is the chief reason that he could enter to the inaccessible Kroḍa patṛas easily[6], so in the composition of this work the 'Krodapatṛa' style is accepted by the author and it is quite natural. In the beginning alone, it is said that the author is going to say something about the Pragalbhalakṣaṇa. Then he keeps himself off from the original texts and concentrates his attention in interpretation. The style SS follows is his own and never touch the other parts of the text.

The author begins the discussion from the first term of the definition i.e Yatsamānādhikaraṇa. The definition of Vyāpti given by Pragalbha is 'yatsamānadhikaraṇa sādhyābhāva pramāyam sādhyavattā jñāna pratibandhakatvam nāsti tattvam'. The explanation begins by raising an objection after giving three alternate meanings to the term 'Yatsamānādhikaraṇa'[7]. He goes on rejecting the modifications put forwarded by himself pointing out 'Avyāpti', 'Ativyāpti' or 'Asambhava' for

the definition. If one Avyāpti is solved by certain insertions another defect will be pointed out and then another clarification follows. These objections are mentioned with the term 'Naca' in the beginning and this style continues until he reaches to a certain stage where further objections will be more misleading. Then the author stops and states his own solutions for each topic which clears all the objections.

The superb excellence the author accepted in composing this book is remarkable. SS's imagination is a peculiar one. In accordance with the inferences we can say that he puts forward many arguments and points out defects in these inferences which nobody can even think off. The way in which the suggestions of untenability of arguments, and defence of point under discussion are done is somewhat in an amazing style. An example may be given from the sixth 'Naca' in the first āvalī, the context is the discussion of the meaning of the term 'Yatsamānādhikaraṇa'. One explanation is given as "Yanniṣṭhādheyatānirūpita Yannirūpitā ca yā adhikaranatā tadvatvṛttitvam"[8]. Then the author points out an "Avyāpti" if this meaning is accepted. Avyāpti is shown in the inference 'Dhūma-dhikaraṇatabhinnaḥ dhūmādhikaraṇatva, dhūmādhikaraṇatvaniṣṭhā-dheyatvaitadanyataratvat'[9]. The inference itself is a peculiar one. In this example the hetu is "dhūmādhikaraṇatva, dhūmādhikaraṇatva

nisthādheyatvaitadanyataratvam". The 'yatsamānādhikaraṇa' - locus of hetu taken here, is the adhikaraṇatva of smoke itself, because when we say 'dhumaniṣṭhādeyatva' - the 'ādheyatva' is existing in the dhūma. So dhūma is the 'adhikaraṇa'. The 'adhikaraṇatā' of smoke, possesses the 'adhikaraṇatātva', and the 'ādheyatva' is existing in the 'dhūmadhikaraṇata', this 'dhumādhikaraṇata' is described by the 'ādheyata' resting in the smoke, and described by the 'hetu'[10]. Then the 'sādhyābhāva pramā' is that there is absence of difference of 'adhikaraṇatā' of smoke (dhūmādhikaraṇatā, dhumadhikaranatā bhedābhāvavān). This is a valid knowledge. The 'Sādhyavattā jñāna' that 'dhumādhikaraṇatā bheda' has obstruction and occur 'Avyāpti'. SS applies high intellectual power to take the 'dhumadhikaranata' as the locus of hetu to point out 'Avyāpti'.

II. Linguistic Techniques applied in NRM

As mentioned before, NRM is a work in Kroḍa patrá style and these kroḍa patraś are the later developed from of works in Navya Nyāya system. The language used in these works is not ordinary sanskrit but it is an analytical language known as Navya Nyāya language. NRM also follows the methodology, techniques and devices that are seen in the Navya Nyāya works. So it is not out of place to think something about this language, which should make the way of entrance easier.

Origin of the Navya Nyāya language

There are various opinion about the origin of Nyāya Śāstra. Satiṣchandra vidhyābhuṣan, the author of the work History of Indian Logic suggests that the Nyāya is originated from 'Ātma vidyā' which was an important topic of discussion in the upanisadic period. Ātma vidyā was at a later stage called 'Ānvikṣikī' and it treated of two subjects viz. the soul and the theory of reasons. In so far as it was mainly concerned with the soul, Ānviksikī was developed into philosophy called 'Darśana' and in so far as it dealt largely with the theory of reasons it was developed into logic[11]. Jwāla Prasād remarks that Nyāyasūtra of Gautama is the first systematic work and it represents a system which was the result of the gradual development of the logical tendancies of the thinkers who lived during the upanisadic period and it into turn became the basis of logic and epistemology as found in the later period[12].

Dr. V.N. Jha an outstanding scholar in Nyāya gives more reliable opinion which is supportive to the previous opinion, about the origin of Nyāya sāstra. He remarks that in ancient Indian society there was a time when one group had questioned the propriety regarding some of the cultural activities in the society and the other group had to give convincing answers to their questions. Those who do not believe in the unseen

result of the rituals, had asked the defenders of vedic culture to explain the cause and effect relationship between the rituals, and the result it is said to produce. It was in this background, there arose a necessity to evolve a system of argumentation. They had to sit together and discuss the problem critically and then reach into the conclusion; because the questions put forward by those were not simple which could have been ignored quitely. As a matter of fact they demanded introspection and rational reaction. It is this process of rational thinking that might have given rise to a full fledged system called the Nyāya system[13]. This idea is clear from the categories included in the Nyāya sūtra. Most of them are linguistic and logic categories which are helpful for conducting discussions in learned councils called 'pariṣads'. Nyāya sūtra and its commentaries are generally considered as the works belonging to the Pracina Nyāya system.

It is an approved fact that each system of philosophy grew through discussions criticisms and counter criticisms. The intellectual dialogue proved to be most fruitful from the point of view of the development of thoughts in India. In the history of the development of concepts in Nyāya system the contribution of Buddhists is remarkable. To quote again V.N. Jha "Had there not been the Buddhists, I doubt whether we would

have got a refined system of philosophical logic like that of Nyāya system[14]. The main business of the commentators of Nyāya sūtra were to refute the Buddhist view and to defend, clarify and explain the Nyāya view[15]. This dialogue lasted for thousand years which resulted in rich texts of discourse.

The main problem faced in these 'Prācīna' texts is that the medium of instruction was ordinary sanskrit which is not an analytical language. The meaning can be understood immediately but more naturality produced more ambiguity and this method had mixing or misleading to a meaning which is not intended by the author. For example the term 'upalabdhi' is used by Gautama to denote knowledge[16]. So 'upalabdhi sādhana' means a pramāṇa. The meaning is easily understood. But there is a problem that the knowledge may be right or wrong. Similarly 'sādhana' can denote any kāraka, kartā, karma or karaṇa so there occur ambiguity. This ambiguity is later solved by replacing the word 'Pramā' for valid knowledge and karaṇa for sādhana. This karaṇa is considered as the uncommon cause and then one can understand that pramāṇa is the uncommon cause of a valid knowledge.

Another example from the Prācīna Nyāya is the 'Anumāna Sūtra'[17]. In that sūtra the expression "atha tatpūrvakam' is explained in

various ways by different commentators because there is ambigiuty in the meaning. Hence in the philosophical discourse there arose the necessity for developing a language and technique which can communicate precisely the apt meaning intended by the author, i.e without any ambiguity. The problem exercised for thousand years gave rise to a language called Navya Nyāya. This language although seems to be an artificial one is really an evolved one.

Navya Nyāya - an outline

The commonly accepted theory about the origin of this new school of logic is that Gangeśopādhyāya who flourished in Mithila in 12th Centuary A.D.[18] started this new school. But another opinion is that it is not possible for any scholar, however intelligent and talented he may be, to introduce an altogether new and finished method of interpretation, unless the grounds are slowly prepared by other scholars before him. According to D.C. Guha "Actually before the advent of Gangeśopādhyāya the Prābhākara school of Mimāmsakās had paved the way to Gangeśopadhyāya in this new method of approach which is commonly known as the technique of Navya Nyāya[19]. Gangeśopādhyāya's Tatvacintāmaṇi introduces a new era in the development of logic and recokened as the first work on the modern school of Hindu logic[20]. A

galaxy of astute logicians like Raghunātha Śiromaṇi, Gadādhara Bhaṭṭācarya Maḍurānātha Tarka vāgīśa and Jagadīśa made this branch of learning so perfect and useful for unambigious expression of subtle ideas. Later on the books or dissertations in any branch of sanskrit study like Vyākaraṇa, Vedānta and Aesthetics accepted this as the standard language for precise communication.

For bringing out the hair splitting subtelety in meaning and for giving fine definitions to terms used, the Navya Nyāya has invented numerous technical terms like 'Ādhara Ādheya', 'Pratiyogin', 'Anuyogin', 'Avacchedaka', 'Avacchinna', 'Nirūpaka', 'Nirūpita' and so on[21].

The relations like samavāya, samyoga, kālika and paryāpti are also used in innumerable places. This complex system in terminology is the important problem facing by the ordinary readers. The Navya Nyāya appears to be altogether different in its language even not having any similarity with the language of Prācīna Nyāya. So a thorough training under a traditional scholar of this branch of study is necessary without which the readers generally do not appreciate the perfect technique of Navya Nyāya. The help of numerous abstracts and technicalities are unavoidable because without them the extreme thoroughness in analysis and the highest perfection cannot be attained. So the Navya Nyāya

language is the natural outcome of an effort to communicate the accurate idea from the sentences.

III. The Application of Navya Nyāya techniques in the NRM

SS applied this Navya Nyāya language and techniques to compose his work NRM Some examples from the work are given below - First example is from the beginning ie the interpretation of the term 'Yatsamānādhikaraṇa' of the definition[22]. He gives three types of interpretations to the term using some of the techniques of Navya Nyāya. The first explanation for the term 'Yatsamanādhikaraṇa' is 'Yannirūpitādhikaranatāvat vṛttitvam'[23]. Here the method of using 'ādheya', 'ādheyatā', 'adhikaraṇa', 'adhikaraṇatā', 'nirūpita' and 'vṛttitva' are applied to get the accurate idea. In the definition yat (it) denotes 'hetu' or 'ādheya' because the application of the definition is to be done in the hetu, as vyāpti is the property of a hetu. 'Ādheya' is that which exists in a locus and 'ādheyatā' is the special property of this 'ādheya'. 'Adhikaraṇa' is the locus in which the 'ādheya' resides[24], 'ādhāra āśraya' are synonyms of 'adhikaraṇa'. 'Adhikaraṇatā' is the special property of adhikaraṇa. As for instance in the inference of fire from smoke, the smoke (hetu) is the 'ādheya' which resides in the mountain, which is the

'adhikaraṇa'. When smoke becomes an 'ādheya' there is 'ādheyata' in the smoke. Likewise when mountain becomes the 'adhikaraṇa' there is the 'adhikaraṇata' and smokeness is the 'ādheyatāvacchedaka'. The 'ādheya' and 'adhikaraṇa' each one can not be called ādheya or 'adhikaraṇa' independently. The smoke got this designation 'ādheya' because it resides on an 'adhikaraṇa' and mountain got the designation 'adhikaraṇa' because the 'ādheya' (smoke) resides in it. So they are pairs and the relation between them is that of described describer (nirūpya nirūpakabhāva) ie mutually dependent. The 'adheyata nirūpaka' is 'adhikaraṇata', and 'adhikaraṇatanirūpita' is the 'ādheyatāta'. In the NRM the explanation of 'Yannirūpitadhikaraṇatā' i.e the 'adhikaraṇatā' described by it (hetu) is the mountainness and the 'adhikaraṇatāvat' is the mountain. The 'sādhyābhāva', the absence of pot qualified with fireness co-exists with smoke on the mountain.

The next explanation is 'yanniṣṭhādheyatā nirūpaka vṛttitvam'. As the first explanation the nirūpyanirūpakabhāva (described decriber relationship) of ādheya and ādhāra is utilised here. The mountain is considered as the nirūpaka (describer) of the ādheyata which exists in the hetu.

The third explanation "Yanniṣṭhādheyatanirūpitādhikaraṇatāvad -

vṛttitvam" the existence of sādhyabhāva is considered on the locus of the adhikaraṇatā which is described by the ādheyatā existing in the hetu. The adhikaraṇatā is the property of adhikaraṇa and that adhikaraṇa is the mountain. The accurate meaning intended by the author is specified by using these Navya Nyāya techniques. In the second āvali also the same method is used to explain the term "vṛttitva" which is interpreted in three alternate meanings[25].

Another instances are given below where SS applies the various relations in the interpretation to get the accurate meaning from the definition. An avyāpti is shown for the definition in the inference "The mountain possesses fire as it possesses smoke". According to Nyāya theory the fire (sādhya) exists in the mountain in the relaion of samyoga (contact) and it is called the Sādhyatāvaccedaka sambandha. Another relation called Kālika Sambandha also is accepted in this system. The kālika sambandha may be either direct or indirect in nature. When all the entities eternal and non eternal are supposed to exist directly in the universal time (Mahākāla), the universal time itself is considered as the relation[26]. Through indirect time relation one entity is qualified by another entity, when those two entities reside in the same time. This relation is usually called Kālika sāmānadhikaraṇya and the non eternal entities are

said to be mutually related through this relation. So even the mountain can be considered as the locus for the absence of fire limited by fireness through that relation[27]. Then the avyāpti is like this,the knowledge of sādhyābhāva in the mountain (locus of hetu) is that it possesses the absence of fire through the relation of time and this valid knowledge will obstruct the knowledge that there is fire on the mountain. This Avyāpti is solved by declaring that the abhāva which exists in the locus is only by peculiar relation (Svarūpa sambandha). The relation between an absence and its locus are said by the Navya Naiyāyika to be of peculiar relation[28]. So the absence of fire by this particular relation cannot exist in the mountain and there is no Avyāpti.

Then another Ativyāpti is suspected where the 'sādhyābhāva' exists by the relation of 'samavāya'. The example shown is that "ghaṭatvābhāvavān dravyatvāt"[29] i.e there is absence of potness as there is substanceness. Here the locus of the hetu is the substance and the 'sādhyābhāva' exists, in it, is that "there is absence of the absence of potness" i.e potness (ghaṭatva) in the relation of svarūpa. The potness exists in its locus only by 'samavāya' relation (inherence) because that is the relation between the genus and individuals[30]. The sādhyābhāva pramā doesn't obstruct the sādhyavattājñāna that there is absence of

potness. So Ativyāpti occurs and to avoid that Ativyāpti the relation of 'sādhyabhāva' in the locus of hetu is mentioned as that which is contradictory to the apprehension of substractumness of sādhya (sādhyavattagrahavirodhitāniyāmaka) and that relation is the limitor of qualifier. Then the relation samavāya can be taken as the relation by which the substanceness exist in the substance. Hence the sādhyābhāvapramā is that there is absence of the potness in the relation of inherence i.e potness exists in the pot (locus of hetu). This knowledge is contradictory to the knowledge of substractumness of sādhya that "there is absence of potness in the pot" and there occur obstruction and no room for Ativyāpti.

Another 'Asambhava' is shown on the inference of fire from smoke on the mountain. The sadhyābāva prama, i.e the absence of pot limited by fireness is a 'vyadhikaraṇadharmavācchinnābhāva' which cannot obstruct the 'sādhyavattā jñāna' and the Asambhava cannot be solved. The clarifications with the concept of relations continues and at last the 'svarūpa sambandha' which is common for positive and negative is accepted as the relation by which the 'sādhyābhāva' exists in the locus of hetu[31].

Another example is noted below where the author uses the concept

of vṛttyaniyāmaka sambandha'[32]. The context is the discussion of the hetutvacchedaka sambandha in the inference where hetu is a qualified generality i.e 'ghataḥ dravyatvavān sattvād'. The author accepts samavāya as the relation and shows defects, if the 'viśiṣṭanirūpita samavāya' is accepted. Then he shows an Avyāpti in the inference of fire from smoke on the mountain. The smoke exists by direct relation i.e by contact on the mountain and it cannot exist by that relation in the lake. The author suspects that 'samyukta samyoga' which also is a samyoga and if that indirect relation is considered to be the 'hetutāvacchedaka sambandha' then even lake can be considered as the locus of smoke and there occur Avyāpti[33]. The author says that there is no scope for this 'Avyāpti' because the indirect relations (paramparā sambandhas) are 'vṛttyaniyāmaka' (non occurrence exacting) in which there is no notion of 'ādhāra' and 'ādheya'. For instance if there is a man with a 'śikhā' in his head is standing in the house we cannot say that the home is the 'ādhara' of 'śikha' in an indirect relation[34]. Similarly the smoke cannot be the 'ādheya' existing in the lake and the lake cannot be considered as the 'ādhāra' in which the 'sādhyābhāva' exists. The non occurrence exacting relations as called so by virtue of their being contents of qualified knowledge though they may not determine the occurrence of one entity in another.

Another example is given below to show the application of 'paryāpti'. The concept 'paryāpti' is inserted frequently for the sake of perfection in the clarification of the subject[35]. The example is taken from the second āvalī. The context is the discussion whether the 'adhikaraṇatā' limited with common properties is different or not from the 'adhikaraṇatā' limited by individual property. An 'Avyāpti' is shown in the inference of fire from smoke on the mountain; by taking the concept that the 'adhikaraṇatā limited by substanceness' (Dravyatvāvacchinnā-dhikaraṇatā) is different from the 'adhikaraṇatā' limited by the individual property 'parvatatva'. To solve the defect an insertion that 'Paryāptya-nuyogitānavacchedakatva' is done in the 'ādheyatva' or 'adhikaraṇatva'. So the 'adhikaraṇatā' which is limited by 'paryāpti' is the 'dravyatva' and 'parvatatva' is not qualified by this particular relation.

The insertion of 'paryāpti' seems to be much important from the stand point of clearly understanding some later developments of Navya Nyāya methodology. The concepts "This is 'one pot' 'These are two pots" clearly establish that there is a separate relation called 'paryāpti' otherwise the concepts 'two' (Dvau) and twoness possessing (Dvitvavān) would become identical[36]. The numbers one and two being the category guṇa, reside in the dravya through the relation of inherence. So twoness resides

even in each of the two substances like two pots through the relation of inherence. But through 'Paryāpti' relation twoness resides in both the two pots taken together and not in one pot only. Hence though one of the two pots may be called 'ghaṭo dvitvavān' the pot is connected with twoness, it cannot be called 'ghato dvau' or 'this pot is two', because the number twoness reside in a substance through the relation of paryāpti. Twoness does not reside in any single one of the two pots[37].

The language of NRM with this Navya Nyāya methodology is difficult to understand to a common reader but at the same time it's study feels interesting and perfect to a trained mind. The subtle and hair splitting analysis of facts and ideas included in it gives a look of difficulty. So there is a view that the Navya Nyāya language is a misuse of one's brain. But really its study goes a long way in sharpening one's faculty and enrich the intellectual powers. The style is amazing in technical terms and with breath taking compounds and it is another reason for feeling difficulty but each and every word in this work has got a precise significance of it's own and these methodology is unavoidable. The study of NRM is an interesting hobby for those who are trained in the Navya Nyāya methodology and they will absolutely appreciate the extreme thoroughness adopted for interpreting a definition.

IV. Referring the views of eminent Navya Naiyāyika-s

Another characteristic feature of the NRM is that SS occasionally gives references to the views of eminent Navya Naiyāyika-s as supportive to his views. For instance in the first āvalī while discussing the 'hetutāvacchedakasambandha' he refers Gadādhara, and says that the pure samavāya is the relation. He adds that in the explanation of 'yatsamānādhikaraṇa', the 'hetutāvacchedakāvacchinnādheyatā nirūpitatva' should be inserted to solve Avyāpti. SS mentions that same idea of Gadādhara is seen in his explanation of the inference 'dravyam, guṇakarmānyatve sati satvat'[38]. Another view of Gadādhara is also referred while postulating the relation called 'paryāpti'. Gadādhara approves this relation in the vyutpattivāda to invalidate the concept of "two skies". In the concept 'two skies' there is invalidity in the part of relation and the knowledge also is invalid.

The view of Jagadīśa is quoted for invalidating the knowledge 'guṇīya samyoga sambandhena vahnimān'[39] there is a contradiction in this knowledge that 'samyoga' is a 'guṇa' and it cannot exist in another 'guṇa'. So there is invalidity in the portion of relation.

Another reference from Raghunāthaśiromaṇi is seen in the second

āvalī. While discussing about the 'pratibandakatāvacchedakatva' to the absence which is in the nature of 'vyadhikaraṇadharmāvacchinna', Śāstr-Śarman is of opinion that the 'vyadhikaraṇadharmāvacchinnābhāva' also can do obstruction for example the knowledge that there is a pot limited by clothness (patatvena ghata), is obstructed by the valid knowledge that there is absence of pot limited by clothness (patatvena ghatābhāva). Same is the opinion of Raghunātha Śiromaṇi. For instance.the knowledge that 'Kānchanamayatvavān vahnimān' - the abode with Kānchanamayatva is the possessor of fire, which is in the form of vyadhikaraṇadharma is obstructed by the knowledge that the mountain is possessing the absence of Kānchanamayatva vahni. It is an example given by Raghunatha Śiromaṇi for 'bādha' hetvābhāsa which obstructs the anumiti[40].

References:

1. *अत्र न चेत्यनेन 'न च' घटितानि वाक्यानि विवक्षितानि । नचानां रत्नानि 'नचरत्नानि'। उत्कृष्टानि न च घटितानि वाक्यानीत्यर्थः। रत्नं "स्वजातिश्रेष्ठेऽपि" इत्यमरः, न च रत्नान्येव, रत्नानि मणय इति श्लिष्टरूपम्। मालैव मालिका स्वार्थकः । नचरत्नानां मालिका पङ्क्तिरेव मालिका स्रक्।* Āloka prakāsa, p-5

2. HIL, p-465

3. Ibid, p-486

4. See article on Kroḍapatra-s, Prahladachar p. 100 J.C.P.R. volume XIV., May. August 1997.

5. *प्रौटेषु विविधेषु क्रोटपत्रेषु क्रीडायां कुशला कुतूहलिनी चादसीया कुशाग्रवन्निशिता शेमुषी दुर्गमानुगममार्गेष्वपि निरर्गलाटनपाटवमधिजग्मुषी चासीत्* Bhūmika on NRM, PRV, p-3

6. Ibid, p-ङ

7. NRM, p-16

8. Ibid, p-20

9. Ibid, p-21

10. *तत्र साध्यशून्ये धूमाधिकरणत्वरूपहेतावपि स्वनिष्ठाधेयत्वाधिकरणतामादाय निरुक्तहेत्वधिकरण-त्वस्योपपादयितुं शक्यात्* Ibid, p-21

11. HIL, p.p. - 5-6

12. History of Indian Epistemology by Jwalaprasad, p-87

13. vide. Contribution of Nyāya system to Indian thought structure VN Jha. Seminar paper - Calicut Unversity 1990.

14. Ibid

15. vide. *यदक्षपादः प्रवरोमुनीनां*
शमाय शास्त्रं जगतो जगाद
कुतार्किकाज्ञाननिवृत्तिहेतुः
करिष्यते तस्य मया निबन्धः NV, Sl. I

16. *बुद्धिरुपलब्धिज्ञानमित्यनर्थान्तरम्* NS, 1.1.15

17. NS, 1.1.5

18. HIL, p-406

19. vide Navya Nyāya system of Logic by D.C. Guha, p-4

20. HIL, p-405

21. See examples given from NRM

22. NRM, p-16

23. Ibid, p-16

24. *यद्ध यत्र वर्तते तत् तस्य आधेयम्, आश्रितम् तद्वृत्ति इति च उच्यते* Navya Nyāya Bhāṣapradipa, p-24

25. NRM, p-53

26. *कालिक नामक सम्बन्धः कश्चित् वृत्तिनियामक कश्चित् वृत्यनियामकोऽस्ति, वृत्तिनियामकेन कालिकसम्बन्धेन काले सर्व वर्तते, स च कालः महाकालरूपः। खण्डकालरूपश्च काले सर्वं इति महाकालविषयिणी प्रतीतिः* Navya Nyāya Bhāṣa pradipa, p-18

27. *अथैवमपि वह्निमान् धूमादित्यादावव्याप्तिः हेत्वधिकरणपर्वतादौ वह्नित्वावच्छिन्नप्रितियोगिताक वह्नभावस्य कालिकसम्बन्धेन वृत्तितया लक्षणघटकत्वात्* NRM, p-64

28. *अभावादेः सम्बन्धः स्वरूपसम्बन्धः यथा भूतले पटो नास्तीत्यादौ भूतले पटाभावस्य स्वरूपसम्बन्ध प्रतीयते, स्वरुप सम्बन्धस्यैव विशेषणता इति नामान्तरम्* Navya Nyāya Bhāṣapradipa, p-13

29. *स्वरूपसम्बन्धेन तद्विवक्षणे च घटत्वाभाववान् द्रव्यत्वादित्यादावतिव्याप्तिः तत्र घटत्वात्मक साध्याभावस्य स्वरूपसम्बन्धेनावृत्तेः* NRM, p-64

30. Tarkasangraha, p-49

31. NRM, p-69

32. *सम्बन्धो द्विविधः, वृत्तिनियामकः वृत्यनियामकश्चेति यस्मिंश्च सम्बन्धे सति एकस्मिन् अपरस्य वृत्तिता आधाराधेयभावः, आश्रयाश्रयिभावो वा प्रतीयते स सम्बन्धः वृत्तिनियामकः। यस्मिश्च सम्बन्धे वृत्तिता आधाराधेयभावश्च न प्रतीयते केवलं सम्बन्धितामात्रं स वृत्यनियामक सम्बन्धः* Navya Nyāya Bhaṣa pradipa, p.p. - 16-17

33. NRM, p-25

34. *परम्परा सम्बन्धः प्रायशः सर्व एव वृत्यनियामकाः अत एव शिखिनि पुरुषे गृहे तिष्ठति स्वाश्रयपुरुषाश्रय सम्बन्धेन "शिखावद्गृहं" इति न प्रयोगः* Navya Nyāya Bāṣa pradipa, p-18

35. NRM, p.p. - 56-63

36. *पर्याप्तिः अयमेको घटः इमौ द्वौ इति प्रतीतिसाक्षिक स्वरूपसम्बन्ध विशेषः। अन्यथा द्वौ, द्वित्ववानिति प्रतीत्योरविशेषप्रसङ्गादिति भावः* Avaccedaka nirukti Dīdidhi, p-262

37. *अयं न द्वौ किन्तु द्वित्ववान् इति प्रतीतेः द्वौ द्वित्ववान् इति अर्थ विशेषावधारणाय नवीनैः कश्चित् पर्याप्तिनामक सम्बन्धः स्वीक्रियते। पर्याप्तिः पर्यवसानम् । साकल्येन सम्बन्धः, अर्थात् यस्य यावन्तः आश्रयाः सन्ति तावत्स्वाश्रयेषु मिलितेष्वेव सम्बन्धः। पर्याप्ति सम्बन्धेन द्वित्वसख्या मिलित्योरेव द्वयोर्वर्तते नत्वेकस्मिन्, एवं त्रित्वसख्या मिलितेष्वेव त्रिषु वर्तते न त्वेकैकास्मिन् द्वयोर्वा ।* Navya Nyāya Bāsā pradipa, p.p. 19-20

38. NRM, p-24

39. Ibid, p-24

40. *तादृशाभावस्याप्रतिबन्धकत्वे बाधग्रन्थे उपनीत काञ्चनमयत्वाद्यवच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताक वह्न्याद्यभावस्य हेत्वाभासत्वोक्तेरसाङ्गत्यं स्यात् स्पष्टं चेदं प्रथम स्वलक्षणे* Ibid, p-54

CHAPTER IV
CONTENT OF NACARATNAMĀLIKĀ

ĀVALĪ - 1

1. The subject of discussion in Nacaratnamālikā

As said before the subject of discussion in Nacaratnamālika is the second definition of Vyāpti given by Pragalbhācārya. The definition is "yatsamānādhikaraṇa sādhyābhāva pramāyām, sādhyavattajñāna pratibandhakatvam nāsti tattvam" - Vyāpti is the state in which the valid knowledge of the absence of sādhya which co-exists in the locus of hetu has no obstructioness to the cognition of 'possessor of probandum' (sadhyavattā jñāna)[1]. In this definition 'yat' denots the hetu and application of the definition should be done in the hetu.

In the inference 'Mountain possesses fire as there is smoke' - 'yat' denots smoke 'yatsamānādhikaraṇa' i.e the locus of hetu is the mountain in which the sādhyābhāva (the absence of sādhya) co-exists The 'sādhyābhāvapramā' is in the nature of 'vyadhikaraṇadharmā-vacchinnābhāva' i.e the absence of pot limited by fireness (Vahnitvena ghaṭābhāva). This knowledge is not obstructive to the sādhyavattajñāna

(the cognition of the possessedness of s̄adhya) that the mountain possesses fire. The knowledge of an object associated with some other's property is contradicted by the definite knowledge of the absence of that object associated with the very same other property. For example the knowledge of pot in the ground with the relation of contact (bhutale ghaṭah) is contradicted by the definite knowledge of the absence of pot associated in the same ground with the same relation. The 'sādhyābhāva pramā' which is in the nature of 'vyadhikaraṇadharmāvacchinna' (that limited with a property which exists is an opposed substratum) cannot obstruct the 'sādhyavattājñāna', which exists in its own nature. So there is vyāpti between the smoke and fire.

2. The explanation for the definition given by the predecessors

All the commentators of the Tattvacintāmaṇi had thought about this definition. Among them the opinions of Raghunātha śiromaṇi, Madhurānātha Tarkavagīśa, Gadhādhara and Jagadīśa are very popular.

Jagadīśa suggests that the sādhyabhāva in the locus of hetu is to be taken in the model of the second definition given by Raghunātha śiromaṇi in his second definition[2] i.e by the nature of 'sādhyatā-

vacchedakāvacchinna vyāpakatāvacchedaka rūpāvacchinna pratiyogitāka'[3].

The reason for this suggestion seems to be that, as per the definition the sādhyābhāva pramā can be taken in various forms. For example in the inference of fire from smoke, the absence of sādhya may be in the form of "an absence of fire qualified with kitcheness (Mahānaseeyatva viśiṣṭa vahnyabhāva) or the absense of two" i.e absence of fire and pot (vahnighaṭobhayābhāva) and this 'sadhyābhāva' co-exists in the locus of smoke and application of the definition can be done. Then there is no need to postulate the 'sādhyābhāva' in the nature of 'vyadhikaraṇadharmāvacchinna'. But the problem occurs is that Gangeśa the author of the original work, Tattvacintāmaṇi rejects the definitions which approve the 'Vyadhikaraṇadharmāvacchinnābhāva' by the expression that 'pratiyogyavṛttiśca dharmaḥ na pratiyogitāvacchedakaḥ'[4] - the property which is not existing in the counterpositive (pratiyogi) cannot be limitor of the counterpositiveness. If the 'sādhyābhāva' is not considered as a 'vyadhikaraṇa dharmāvacchinna' (that property which exists in an opposed substratum) this expression has no relevance. The irrelavance is avoided by the suggestion that the 'sādhyābhāva' is in the model in which the counterpositive is limited by the nature of the limitor

of the 'vyāpakata' and limited by the limitor of the 'sādhya'. So in the example noted before the 'sādhyābhāva' is that negation of the pot limited with fireness (vahnitvena ghaṭābhāvaḥ) is existing in the locus of the hetu and this fireness is the 'vyāpakatāvacchedaka' of the 'sādhya' i.e fire. The absence of pot limited with fireness exists even with the fire, the pratiyogi, ghaṭa is limited with fireness which is 'pratiyogitāvacchedaka' and it has the co-existence with the absence of pot limited by fireness.

Similarly in the inference 'Pot possesses nameability as there is knowability' (ghaṭovācyatvavān prameyatvāt) the 'sādhyābhāva' is the absence of pot limited with 'vācyatva' (vācyatvena ghaṭābhāvaḥ). This 'vācyatva' is limited with the nature of 'vyāpakatāvacchedaka' of the 'sādhya', the absence of pot limited with 'vācyatva' exists even with 'vācyatva'. This 'sādhyābhāva pramā' is not obstructive to the knowledge that 'there is vācyatva in the ghaṭa'. So the 'Avyāpti' in the 'kevalānvayi' inference can be solved. In these inferences the application of definition is done with the 'vyadhikaraṇadharmāvacchinnābhāva' and there is no irrelevance for the opinion of Gangeśa.

The definition has no 'Ativyāpti' in the inference of smoke from fire (dhūmavān vahneḥ) because the absence of generic smoke (dhūma-sāmānyābhāva) is a part of the definition. In the inference noted before

there is no co-existence for the smoke limited by smokeness in the 'red hot iron ball'. So the valid knowledge that there is absence of smoke limited with smokeness contradicts the 'sādhyavattājñāna' that there is smoke[5].

The term 'pramā' (valid knowledge) is added in the definition to solve the 'Asambhava' in the inference of fire from smoke. The 'Asambhava' is shown like this,if some one by mistake understands, the absence of pot limited by fireness, as the general absence of fire, then the knowledge that there is absence of fire on the mountain can obstruct the knowledge that there is fire on the mountain. So there occur 'Asambhava' and it can be solved by the insertion of 'pramā' (valid cognition). According to Nyāya theory the knowledge of the absence of fire in the mountain is not valid[6].

The 'sādhyavattājñāna' should mean the knowledge of 'sādhya' being described by the relation and essence determining it, exists in the locus. On account of this there is no Avyāpti, on the inference "it has fire as it has smoke", though in the valid knowledge viz. mountain is not possessing fire in the relation of inherence and not possessing kitchen fire. There is the obstruction of the knowledge that there is fire in the mountain with the relation of inherene with the knowledge "there is absence

of fire in the mountain with inherence". The obstruction of 'sādhyavattājñāna' should mean as described by its describer and relation[7]. So the fire is negated through the relation of 'samavāya' in the hill which is the locus of smoke. The 'sādhyābhāvapramā' that the mountain is possessing the absence of fire in the relation of 'samavāya' has no obstruction because the relation is not 'samavāya' but 'samyoga' and there is no 'Avyāpti' in the inference of fire from smoke.

3. Interpretation given by Śāstrśarman

NRM of SS begins with a 'mangala śloka' in which he gives obeisance to his revered teacher and declares the subject matter of the work[8]. The expression "bhūyo kincitucyate" (again say something) referes that he is going to say that which is not said by any previous commentators.

The author gives the "vigraha" of the first term of the definition ie yatsamānādhikaraṇa (the locus of hetu where sādhyābhāva co-exists) as 'yasya samānam yatsamānam, yatsamānam adhikaraṇam yasya'. In this vigraha 'yat' denotes the hetu (ādheya) and the first ṣaṣṭi (genetive) case in the vigraha denotes discribedness (nirūpitatva). The second 'ṣaṣṭi' case denotes existing (vṛttitva) of 'sādhyābhāva'. So the intended

meaning of the term is the 'adhikaraṇa' which is described by the hetu, (ādheya) is the locus where the 'sādhyābhāva' (valid knowledge) co-exists.

4. Yatsamānādhikaraṇa - the first term of the definition

The first topic discussed by SS in the NRM is the first term of the definition i.e 'yatsamānādhikaraṇa'. At first he gives three alternate interpretations for the term.

Yatsamānādhikaraṇa →
- Yannirūpitādhikaraṇatāvad vṛttitvam
- Yanniṣṭhādheyatānirūpaka vṛttitvam
- Yanniṣṭhādheyatānirūpitādhikaraṇatāvad vṛttitvam[9]

The first interpretation is refuted due to 'Avyāpti' in the inference 'Abhāvaḥ ghaṭatvābhāvavān, svarūpasambandhāvacchinna, ghaṭanirūpitādheyatvād' - absence is devoid of potness, as there is the 'ādheyatva' described by pot and limited by the relation 'svarūpa'. In this inference 'sādhya' is the absence of potness, hetu is (the existence) the 'ādheyatva' described by pot and limited by peculiar relation (svarūpasambandha). The 'yatsamānādhikaraṇa' as per first

interpretation, the locus of adhikaraṇata described by the hetu is the pot itself and the 'sādhyābhavapramā' is that there is the absence of the absence of potness (ghaṭatvābhāvābhāvavān). The double negation refers to the counterpositive ie 'potness', so the 'sādhyavattājñāna' (absence of potness)' has obstruction and occur 'Avyāpti'. So this interpretation cannot be accepted.

The second interpretation also is untenable because of an 'Avyāpti', in the inference of fire on the mountain from smoke. The 'Avyāpti' is shown by accepting the Nyāya theory that the 'prakārata' (chief qualifierness) and 'viśeṣyatā' (qualificandness) are mutually dependent properties and they are having the relation of described discriber (nirūpyanirūpakabhāva sambandha) similarly the 'ādheyatā' and 'adhikaraṇatā' are mutually dependents and their relation is that of described desriber. Hence in the inference of fire from smoke on the mountain, the 'yatsamānādhikaraṇa' in the form of 'yanniṣṭādheyatā nirūpaka', is the 'adhikaraṇatā' existing in the mountain, and not the mountain. So the knowledge of 'sādhyābhāva' existing in the describer, i.e the 'adhikaraṇatā' in the mountain possesses the absence of fire, is a valid knowledge because 'adhikaraṇatā' is a property not a substance and fire cannot exist in that property. So there occur the obstruction for

the 'sādhyavattājñāna' (fire possessing). Another clarification is done to avoid the 'Avyāpti' - that an insertion of the term 'hetvadhikaraṇatā-bhinnatva' (adhikaraṇata which is different from that of hetu) is done but then Ativyāpti is shown in an inference 'adhikaraṇatā bhinnam prameyatvāt'. It is an invalid inference because 'prameyatva' exists everywhere even in the adhikaraṇatā. So the 'yatsamānādhikaraṇa' - the describer of the ādheyatā existing in such a hetu is, the pot etc where the 'sādhyābhāva' - 'adhikaraṇatābhedābhāva'[10] (adhikaraṇatā) exists in the form of 'vyadhikaraṇadharmāvacchinna' - i.e pot possesses the 'adhikaraṇatābhedābhāva' in the nature of potness and this knowledge is not obstructive to the knowledge of 'sādhyavattā' (adhikaraṇatā-bhedavān) and occur 'Ativyāpti'. Then another clarification that 'svanirūpakatva, svanirūpitatvobhaya sambandhena, yanniṣṭhādheyata-viśiṣṭatva' is inserted i.e 'yatsamānādhikarāṇa' should be understood as the 'ādheyatāviśiṣta' which is existing in the hetu and which has two relations ie 'svanirūpakatva' and 'svanirūpitatva'. According to this interpretation the 'adhikaraṇatā' should be qualified with the adheyata of hetu with two relation i.e describeness and describedness. So the 'adhikaraṇatā' existing in the 'prameyatva' is not having the relation of describedness (nirūpitatva) and there is no Ativyāpti. But another 'Ativyāpti' in the inference 'Paṭaḥ ghaṭābhāvavanniṣṭādheyatā nirūpita-

dhikaranatābhinnam ghaṭābhāvat' ie cloth is different from the adhikaraṇatā which is described by the ādheyatā existing in the absence of pot as it is the absence of pot. The 'adhikaraṇatā' qualifed with the 'ādheyatā' existing in the hetu is the 'adhikaraṇatā' of pot itself. The 'sādhyābhāvapramā' is that there is absence of difference of the 'adhikaraṇatā' described by the 'ādheyatā' existing in the absence of pot by the relation of conjunction (samyogena ghaṭe ghaṭābhāvavanniṣṭādheyatā nirūpitabhedaḥ). So there is no obstruction for the 'sādhyavattājñāna' and there occur 'Ativyāpti'. So this second explanation cannot be accepted.

The third explanation for 'yatsamānādhikaraṇa' (yanniṣṭādheyatā-nirūpitādhikaraṇatāvad vṛttitvam) is not accepted because the author suspects 'Avyāpti' in the inference of fire from smoke on the mountain[11]. The 'Avyāpti' is shown by the concept that 'ādhārādheyabhāvayoḥ ādhārādheyarūpatva'. The property of 'ādhāra' and 'ādheya' are the essence of ādhāra and ādheya - i.e the property ādhāratva is the nature of ādhāra itself. For example the ādhāratā existing in the mountain is in the nature of mountain and the ādheyatā existing in the fire is the essence of fire itself. So in our typical example the ādheyatā described by the mountain and limited by the relation of conjunction is the 'ādheyatā' existing in smoke, similarly the ādheyata described by the lake and which is

limited by the relation of time is the ādheyatā existing in the smoke. If there is identity between these 'ādheya-s' - the 'adhikaraṇatātva' described by the 'ādheyatā' existing in the smoke limited by the relation of conjunction is to be accepted as existing in the lake also. Then the 'sādhyābhāvaprama' - the lake is 'possessing the absence of fire', which obstruct the knowledge that there is fire and occur 'Avyāpti'. This 'Avyāpti' is solved by the insertion that 'the adhikaraṇatva' should be described through the ādheyata, which is limited by the limiting property and the relation of hetuta'[12]. So the 'ādheyatā' which is limited by the property smokeness and limited by the relation 'conjuction', cannot exist in the lake.

Then if the 'ādhāratva' is in the nature of 'ādhāra' another 'Avyāpti' is shown in the inference. 'Abhāvaḥ guṇaśūnyatāvān bhāvabhinnatvād' - absence is devoid of quality, as it is different from a positive entity. The 'adhikaraṇatā' is accepted as the 'adhikaraṇasvarūpa' so the pot is the 'adhikaraṇa' where absence of clothness exists. The 'adhikaraṇatā' existing in the absence of clothness is described by the 'hetu', 'bhāvabhinnatva'. So the 'sādhyabhāvapramā' is that there is absence of the absence of quality (guṇaśūnyatvābhāva) i.e there is quality in the pot and there occur 'Avyāpti'. So the concept that the 'ādhāratā' in the

form of 'ādhara' is not recognised and for simplicity (lāghava) the ādheyatā is accepted as the nature of 'ādheya'. But it can be not approved because there is no strict rule to accept or deny each of the concept (vinigamakābhāvāt). After these clarification the defects cannot be solved. So the term 'yatsamānādhikaraṇa' is interpreted as 'yanniṣṭādheyatā-nirūpitā, yannirūpita ca yā adhikaraṇatā tadvad vṛttitvaṁ - the occurrence in the locus of 'adhikaraṇatā' which is described by the 'ādheyatā' existing in hetu and described by it. In the inference mountain has fire as there is smoke - the hetu smoke exists on the mountain which is the abode of the 'adhikaraṇatā' - and this 'adhikaraṇatā' is described by the 'ādheyatā' limited with smokeness and by the hetu smoke. So the 'Sādhyābhāva pramā' is that 'there is absence of pot limited by fireness and there is no obstruction for the 'sādhyāvattā jñāna'. But in that explanation also defect is shown by the author himself. The defect is an 'Avyāpti' in a complicated inference i.e 'dhūmādhikaraṇabhinnaḥ dūmādhikaraṇatva, dhūmadhikaraṇatva-niṣṭhādheyatvaniṣṭhādheyatvaitadanyataratvāt'[13]. By the insertion 'hetvavṛttyadhikaraṇatā' (the adhikaraṇatā which is not existing in the hetu) is done and the 'Avyāpti' is solved but another 'Avyāpti' can be noted in the 'kevalānvayi' inference where the hetu is 'prameyatva' and the 'adhikaraṇatā' which is not existing in the hetu is unexampled[14] (aprasidhaḥ).

The final explanation for the yatsamānādhikaraṇa is that "svaniṣṭa hetutāvacchedakāvacchinnādheyatā nirūpita svanirūpitatvobhaya-sambandhena hetu viśiṣṭa adhikaraṇatāvad vṛttitvam"[15] i.e yatsamānādhikaraṇa should be understood as the existence (of sādhyābhāva) in the locus of the adhikaraṇatā qualified with the hetu and having the ādheyatā described by the two relations ie the ādheyatā described by the limitor of the hetu existing in it and described by this hetu. The application can be done in our example. "The mountain possesses fire as there is smoke". The hetu is smoke - the ādheyatā exists in the smokeness and the mountain is the adhikaraṇa which possesses the adhikaraṇatā. The smoke is limited by the essence smokeness and exists on the mountain by two relations ie described by the ādheyatā which is limited by limitor of hetutā existing in hetu and described by the smoke.

This qualified 'adhikaraṇata' exists in the 'adhikaraṇa' i.e in the mountain in which the 'sādhyābhāva' - 'absence of pot limited with fireness', co-exist. As the 'hetuta' existing in the hetu is understood as limited by the limitor of 'hetuta' there is no 'Avyāpti' in the inference 'ghaṭaḥ dravyatvavān viśiṣṭa sattvād' - pot possesses the substanceness as there exists the qualified generality. This generality is qualified with

the difference from quality and action (g .unakarma bheda visista). So the locus of such generality exists only in substance. So the 'sādhyābhāvapramā' is that there is absence of substractumness limited by quality (guṇatvena dravyatvābhāvaḥ). This valid knowledge is not contradictory to the knowledge that there is substanceness in the pot. So there is 'vyāpti' between 'viśiṣta sattā' and 'dravyatva'. The 'viśiṣta sattā' exists only in the substance.

5. Hetutāvacchedaka sambandha in the inference where the hetu is a qualified generality. (viśiṣta satta hetuka anumāne hetutāvacchedaka sambandha)

The next topic discussed in the NRM by SS is the relation of the limitor of the 'hetuta' in an inference where the hetu is a qualified generality[16]. In the inference of fire from smoke on the mountain, the hetu smoke exists on the mountain by the relation of conjunction (samyoga) and it is the 'hetutāvacchedaka sambandha'. According to the Nyāya theory 'sattā' is the generic charecter which exists in the substance, (dravya) quality (guṇa) and action (karma) by the relation of samavāya. The sattā qualified with the difference from quality and action (guṇakarmabhedaviśiṣta sattā) exists in the substance. Then there occur a problem in the inference 'pot is a substance as there is qualified

generality' (ghaṭaḥ dravyam viśiṣṭasattvād) that the qualified generality (hetu) exists in the substance either by the relation of 'samavāya' or by 'viśiṣṭa nirūpita samavāya'[17]. It is an approved fact that the knowledge of the relation by which the hetu exists in the subject (hetutāvacchedaka sambandha) and the relation by which the 'sādhya' exists (sādhyatāvacchedaka sambandha) should be considered in all the inferences and that should be taken into consideration as they varies. So the 'parāmarśa' that the pot possesses the qualified generality which is the pervader of the substances (dravyatva vyāpya guṇakarmabedha viśiṣṭasattāvan ghaṭaḥ) is the 'karaṇa' of that 'anumiti'. Hence in this inference where the hetu is a qualified generality the relation of limitor of the 'prakāratā' is not mere 'samavāya' but a 'samavāya' which is described by the qualified entity (Viśiṣṭa nirūpita samavāya).

Then another issue arises that while interpreting the term 'yat samānādhikaraṇa' the 'hetutāvacchedakāvacchinnādheyatā nirūpitatva' which is inserted to solve the 'avyāpti' that may occur in the inference 'dravyam viśiṣṭa sattvād' has no relevance because by this relation, 'viśiṣṭa nirūpita samavāya' the 'sattā' exists only in substance and there is no room for 'avyāpti'. Then it is said that this special kind of relation is to be accepted to differentiate the qualified knowledge (viśiṣṭa–

vaiśiṣṭyāvagāhi jñāna) from the knowledge in the form of qualifier and qualificand.

SS is of opinion that there is no necessity to approve that 'viśiṣṭa nirūpita samavāya' as the relation. If it is accepted that there will be no such qualified knowledge 'as samyogenaikatva prāgabhāva viśiṣṭaghaṭavad samyogena rūpavān' - as there is no 'viśiṣta pratiyogi vaiśiṣṭya'. There is contradiction in the counter positiveness which is qualified with 'samyoga', 'ekatva' and 'prāgabhāva', to that counter positiveness which is qualified with colourness. So there the relations cannot be accepted because 'ekatva', and 'samyoga' are qualities, which cannot exist in another quality, colour cannot exist by the relation of conjunction. So the 'viśiṣṭa nirūpita samavāya' is not capable to differentiate the qualified knowledge from that in the form of qualifier and qualificand and another reason should be mentioned.

Another argument to invalidate the previous knowledge is that there is invalidity on the part of relation and another view of eminent logician are referred to as support of SS[18]. So if the 'samavāya' whose adjunct (pratiyogi) is a qualified one, is approved, then also the insertion of 'hetutāvacchedakāvacchinnādheyatā nirupitatva' is necessary because there is identity between this 'pure samavāya' and 'viśiṣta samavāya'

and if 'pure samavāya' is considered as the 'hetutāvaccedaka sambandha' there will be 'avyāpti'[19].

Another view is that 'hetutāvacchedaka sambandhatavacchedakatā paryāptyadhikaraṇa dharma paryāptāvacchedakatākatva' also should be inserted to avoid 'Avyāpti' in the inference of fire from smoke. The 'Avyāpti' is shown with the indirect relation which is not considered as a relation for approving vyāpti[20]. The insertion of 'paryāpti' is supported or else there will be 'avyāpti' in the inference 'Rūpam janya guṇatvavān samavāya kālikobhaya sambandhena guṇatvād'. In this inference 'kālika' is also a relation of 'hetutāvacchedaka' and the pot can be considered as the 'janya guṇatvavān' by time relation and the 'sādhyābhāvapramā' - the pot is possessing the absence of 'guṇatva' and has obstruction to the 'sādhyavattājñāna'. If 'paryāpti' is inserted the pot cannot be considered as the locus of hetu by these two relations and the 'Avyāpti' can be solved.

If paryāpti is inserted there is no need to mention the 'hetutāvacchedaka sambandha', but according to the new logicians there is identity in qualified relation and pure relation. So the 'hetutāvacchedakāvacchinnatva' is inserted and the 'sambandha' in this inference is regarded as pure 'samavāya'. The difference of the qualified knowledge

from the other is that, the qualifier is always in the pure relation and limitor of the qualifier exists in the property of qualifier depending on the qualificand[21]. Hence the acceptance of the qualified relation and invalidity in the part of relation is not necessary and the insertion of 'hetutāvaccedakāvacchinnatva' in the explanation is relevant.

The view of Jagadīśa is shown by the author. Accordng to him the 'ādhāratva' and 'ādheyatva' limited by common properties, are different from those limited with individual properties. So the insertion of 'hetutāvaccedaka' is necessary to solve the 'Avyāpti' in the inference of fire from smoke. The smoke is considered as a substance and the lake is regarded as the locus of smoke (dravyatvena). So lake is the locus of the 'adhikaraṇatā' limited with substances described by the 'ādheyata' limited by substanceness which exists in smoke[22]. The 'sādhyābhāva pramā' is that the lake possesses the absence of fire and this knowledge has obstruction to the 'sādhyavattājñāna'. If 'hetutāvacchedaka' is insisted in the 'ādheyatā' i.e the smoke limited with smokeness is to be considered and smoke cannot to be regarded as a mere 'dravya'.

Next is the view of Jagadīśa about the 'adhikaraṇatā-s' which are limited by the specific property and common property. One view is that the 'adhikaraṇata-s' existing in the 'adhikaraṇa' are not distinct, for eg-the

'pure sattā' exists in the pot, cloth etc and they are the 'adhikaraṇa-s' of 'pure sattā' and at the same time they are the abode of qualified generality (viśiṣṭa sattā) also. So there is no need to consider difference in these 'adhikaraṇatā-s'.

But Jagadīśa the prominent logician mentions that in the cognition that 'ghaṭasamudāyo rūpavān' (the community of pot possess the colour) the concept of samudāya is obvious. It is not limited with specific properties. There is no cognition like 'community of pot possess that colour (tat rūpavān)'. So this cognition is the base to approve distinction. Another reason is that the 'adhikaraṇata' existing in the kitchen is described by the fire existing in the kitchen. It is different from the 'adhikaraṇata' described by "that fire" (tat vahni). If the 'Mahānaseeya vahnitva adhikaraṇata' - the 'adhikaraṇata' described by kitchen fire is considered as identical to the adhikaranata of "that fireness", the cognition of the absence of the kitchen fire will not be contradictory to knowledge of kitchen fire. Here the contradictorness exists with a relation of 'paryāpti' in both the kitchen and the fire, not in the fire alone. So there is difference in the 'adhikaraṇata-s' in accordance with the difference in the 'nirūpaka' and 'avacchedaka'. It is an accepted fact that there is difference even between the concepts of 'Mahānaseeya vahni' and 'vahnimahānaseeya'

as there is difference in the qualifier and qualificand.

At the end of the first āvali, Śāstṛ Śarman shows an avyāpti in the inference where the hetu is described through the relation of identity (tādātmya). But the answer to the problem is already given that the identity is a non occurrence exacting relation (vṛttyaniyāmaka) and the vyāpti is not accepted by that relation. So in the body of the definition of 'vyāpti' the 'hetvadhikaraṇatva' (locusness of hetu) is inserted and the 'vyāpti' differs according to the difference of 'hetu' and 'sādhya' in the inference.

Āvalī II

1. Nature of 'Sādhyābhāva vṛttitva' in the locus of hetu

The second āvali of NRM includes twenty four jewels of 'Naca's. It begins with the interpretation to clear the meaning of vṛttitva (ādheyatva). In the first āvali the vigraha for the first term of the definition i.e 'yatsamānādhikaraṇa' is given[23] and as per the vigraha the meaning of the genetive case (ṣaṣthi) is given as 'vṛttitva'. So the intended meaning of the first two terms - 'yatsamānādhikaraṇa sādhyābhāva' is that the sādhyābhāva in the nature of an opposed object exists in the same locus where the hetu exists. So there is the co existence - 'Sāmānadhikaraṇya'.

The 'Sādhyābhāva' exists in the locus. Hence it can be regarded as an 'ādheya' and 'ādheyata' exists in it.

In the first āvalī the meaning of the term 'yatsamānādhikaraṇa' is explained by adopting three variant interpretations and all of them were rejected by pointing out defects, similarly the meaning of vṛttitva also is explained by three opinion[24]. The first interpretation is that the 'hetvadhikaraṇaniṣṭatva', is to be taken in the form of 'ādheyatā' described by the 'adhikaraṇatā of hetu'. This meaning can be applied in our typical example, 'The mountain has fire as there is smoke'. The 'sādhyābhāva' in the nature of 'vyadhikaraṇadharmāvacchinna' is the absence of pot limited by fireness, exists, in the mountain. So it is the 'ādheya'. The 'ādheyata' exists in the 'sādhyābhāva' and it is described by the 'adhikaraṇatā' which exists in the mountain. But an objection is raised by the author in this explanation. The defect is that there is 'Avyāpti' in the inference 'ghataḥ kincidavacchinnaḥ, adhikaraṇatvād' - pot is limited by something as there exists the 'adhikaraṇatva'. In this example the 'adhikaraṇatva' is the 'hetu' and 'kincidavacchinnatva' is the 'sādhya'. The 'adhikaraṇa' of the 'hetu' is, the pot, it is the abode of the 'adhikaraṇatā' in which exists the absence of limitedness.[25] So the 'kincida-vacchinnatvābhāva' exists in the pot, in the nature of 'ādheyata' described

by the 'adhikaraṇatā' of 'hetu'. So the 'sādhyavattājñānā kñcitavacchinnatva' is obstructed by the 'sādhyābhāvapramā' and there occur 'Avyāpti'.

Then another interpretation is that 'the occurrence of sādhyābhāva in the locus of hetu', is in the nature of describerness of the 'adhikaraṇata', which exists in the locus of 'hetu'. This explanation is not acceptable as there is 'Avyāpti' in the inference 'gaganam vṛttitvābhāvavān śabdāśrayatvād' - 'Ether posses the absence of superstratumness as it is the abode of sound'. It is a valid inference because ether which is all pervading does not rest as the 'ādheya'. So the absence of 'ādheyata' exists in the ether. 'Avyāpti' is shown like this, the abode of 'śabdāśrayatva' is the ether and 'adhikaraṇata' described by 'Prameyatva' exists in it. The describerness of the 'adhikaraṇata' i.e the 'Prameyatva' exists in the 'sādhyābhāva'. This 'sādhyābhāva' (vṛttitva) obstructs the knowledge of 'sādhyavattā' i.e the 'vṛttitvābhāva' and occur 'avyāpti'[26].

The third interpretation is that the 'sādhyābhāva' exists as the nature of 'ādheyatā' which is described by the 'adhikaraṇatā' existing in the locus of 'hetu'. 'Avyāpti' can be shown in this explanation as in the previous example - 'vṛttitvābhāvavan śabdāśrayatvād' - the 'vṛttitva' i.e 'sadhyābhāva', as the 'ādheyatā' which is described by 'adhikaraṇatā' is, 'prameyatvādhikaraṇatā' - exists in the locus of 'hetu' i.e in the ether.

Then another 'Avyāpti' in the typical example 'The mountain has fire as there is smoke' is shown because the 'adhikaraṇatā' of 'hetu' is regarded as the 'adhikaraṇatā', existing in the 'prameyatva' which exists in the 'hetu' and the absence of fire exists, as the 'ādheyatā' described by the 'adhikaraṇatā' existing in 'prameyatva'.

SS accepts all these defects by the term 'Satyam' and gives some clarification[27]. Then the application can be done in the inference 'Mountain has fire as there is smoke'. The 'vyadhikaraṇadharmā-vacchinnābhāva', the absence of fire limited by fireness exists as the describedness of the individual mountain (parvata vyaktinirūpitatvam) which is the locus of 'hetu'. The 'ādheyata' which exists in the absence of pot limited by fireness, is described by the 'adhikaraṇatā' which is existing in the individual mountain and the absence of pot limited with fire is with that 'ādheyatā'.

Then an 'Avyāpti' is shown in the inference of fire from smoke in the mountain by the concept that the 'adhikaraṇatā' limited by common property is different from that limited by individual property. This defect is solved by inserting the term 'paryāptyanuyogitāvacchedaka'. Then the existence of 'sādhyābhāva', is shown in another way.[28] The 'sādhyābhāva' exists by the nature of 'ādheyatva' described by the

'paryāptādhikaraṇatā' qualified with the locus of hetu by two relations ie 'svāśrayatva' and 'svāvacchedakatva'. If the 'paryāptādhikaraṇatā' is not accepted to an 'adhikaraṇatā' existing in the single object, then an insertion, 'adhikaraṇatāvyāpyatva' is given in the place of 'paryāptatva'.[29] The 'adhikaraṇatā' limited with common properties can be avoided by this insertion because the 'adhikaraṇatā' limited with common properties exists by the nature of 'vyāpakatva' not by 'vyāpyatva'.

2. The relation by which the sādhyābhāva exists in the locus of hetu

In all the definitions of 'Vyāpti' the relations of 'sādhyatāvacchedaka' and 'hetutāvacchedaka' should be understood clearly. The relation by which 'sādhya' comes in the locus is called 'sādhyatāvacchedaka sambandha' and the relation by which hetu comes in the locus is called 'Hetutāvacchedaka sambandha'. For instance 'sādhyavadanyāvṛttitvam' which is one among the definitions of 'vyāptipancaka', the 'samyoga' is mentioned as the 'sādhyatāvacchedaka sambandha',[30] to the inference of fire from smoke in the mountain. If it is not insisted the 'samavāya' can be taken as the relation and there will be 'Avyāpti' because the absence of fire exists in the kitchen by the relation of inherence; so the kitchen can be taken as 'sādhyavadanya'. But the 'avṛttitva' of hetu (non -

existence of smoke) in the locus of the absence of sādhya is not possible. Similarly the relation by which the 'sādhyābhāva' exists in the locus of hetu should be insisted in the 'pragalbhalakṣana' also. The relation 'svarūpa' is proposed first but that is rejected by pointing 'Ativyāpti' in the inference-'ghaṭatvābhāvavān dravyatvād'. In this inference the 'sādhyābhāva' - 'ghaṭatva' exists not by the relation of 'svarūpa',but by 'samavāya'. Hence the 'sādhyābhāvapramā' is in the form of; 'svarūpena ghaṭatvābhāvavān na' - (there is not the existence of the absence of 'ghatatva' by the relation of svarūpa) and this knowledge cannot obstruct the knowledge of the existence of 'sādhya' in the locus. Then any relation which prohibits the apprehension of 'sādhyavatta' is proposed but that is not acceptable because the 'vyadhikaraṇadharmāvacchinnasādhyābhāva' is not doing obstruction for the apprehension of the existence of 'sādhya'. So there will be 'Asambhava'. At last the 'svarūpa' which is common for positive and negative is approved as the relation by which the 'sādhyābhāva' exists in the locus of 'hetu'. In the inference 'ghaṭatvābhāvavān dravyatvād' - the 'sādhyābhāva', 'ghaṭatvābhāvābhāva' i.e the 'ghaṭatva' which is in the form of a positive, exists in the locus by the relation 'svarūpa'. So the 'sādhyabhāvapramā' - there is 'ghaṭatva' in the relation of 'svarūpa', can obstruct the 'sādhyavatta' 'jñānā' i.e there is absence of 'ghaṭatva' and 'Ativyāpti' can be solved.

3. Sādhyatāvacchedaka sambandhāvacchinnatva in the counterpositive of the sādhyābhāva.

The 'sādhyatāvacchedaka sambandha' is the relation by which 'sādhya' exists in the locus. For example the existence of fire (sādhya) in the mountain is limited by the relation of contact. For the application of 'pragalbha lakṣaṇa', the 'sādhyābhāva' is taken in the form of 'vyadhikaraṇa dharmāvacchinna' and it is to be limited by the relation of 'sādhyatāvacchedaka' or else the counterpositive limited by other relations may be taken and occur 'Avyāpti'. Then the problem arises is that, if the 'sādhyābhāva' in the form of absence of pot limited with fire. and the 'counterpositive' is the 'pot', which is not limited with the relation of 'sādhyatāvacchedaka'[31]. At first a device is recommended that the insertion of the relation of 'sādhyatāvacchedaka' may be given not to the 'sādhyabhāva' that exists in the locus of hetu but to the 'sādhyavattājñāna' (vahnimān). But it is against the accepted rule that the 'sambandhāvacchinnatva' may be inserted in the counterpositive of the 'abhāva' or else the expression of Gangeśa that 'pratiyogyavṛttiśca dharma na pratiyogitāvacchedaka' has no relevance[32]. To solve these problems it is to be accepted that the counterpositive of the 'vyadhikaraṇa dharmāvacchinnābhāva' also as limited by the relation of

'sādhyatāvacchedaka'. SS holds that it can be accepted with the help of our experience. For example the knowledge that 'samyogena ghaṭatvena pato nāsti' - there is absence of cloth limited with the property of 'ghaṭa' in the relation of conjunction (samyoga). In this cognition the cloth cannot exists with the property of pot hence it is a 'vyadhikaraṇa dharma' and the 'ghaṭatva' - a generic property cannot exist by the relation of 'samyoga', so it is a 'vyadhikaraṇa sambandha'. But this is a valid cognition that arises for all. If this experience cannot be approved, there will be no cognition of objects which are limited with the properties that co exist in them for instance the knowledge of 'blue pot' (nīlo ghaṭaḥ) where the potness and blueness co exist in the pot.

There is an objection to this view that the cognitions which are limited with the co existing properties are valid and the obstruction for the contradictory knowledge comes to such cognitions only, not to that limited with the 'vyadhikaraṇadharma'. For example, the knowledge that the lake posses fire by contact relation is obstructed by the valid knowledge that the fire is not existing in the lake by contact relation (hṛdo samyogena vahnyabhāvavān). If it is not accepted the knowledge of the absence of an object by the relation of 'svarūpa' will be obstructive to the knowledge of that object existing by any other relations i.e which

exists by the relation of 'samyoga', 'samāvaya' etc. Our experience is that the knowledge of the absence of pot in the ground by the relation of 'samavāya' is not obstructive to the knowledge that there is pot in the ground by the relation of 'samyoga'. So the cognition limited by 'vyadhikaraṇadharma' is not doing obstruction and cannot be limited by the 'sādhyatāvacchedaka sambandha'.

SS is of opinion that in our experience there occur obstruction even for the knowledge which is not having these co existent properties. For example the knowledge of 'paṭa' qualified with 'ghaṭava' (ghaṭatvena paṭaḥ) which is the knowledge of an object limited with opposed property is obstructed by the knowledge that there is absence of 'paṭa' limited with 'ghaṭatva' (ghaṭatvena paṭābhāvavān). So this counterpositive also is limited with the relation (sambandhāvacchinna). In support of this view, SS gives the opinion of Raghunātha śiromany who approves contradictoriness for the knowledge of fire limited with the property of gold (kāñcanamaya vahniman) to the knowledge that the mountain is not possessing the golden fire. It is an example given to the fallacy of hetu (hetvābhāsa) viz. 'bādha' which is directly obstructive to the 'anumiti'.

4. Obstruction of contradictory knowledge - an examination

It is an approved fact that the knowledge of the existence of something will not occur when there is a contradictory knowledge that there exists the absence of that object. For instance the cognition of the existence of fire in the lake will not arise when there is the definite knowledge that the lake possesses the absence of fire as there exists water. Then there is a problem that the knowledge according to Nyāya is an 'avyāpyavṛtti guṇa' and it is 'kṣaṇika'[33]. 'Avyāpyavṛtti' means that does not pervades in all parts of the locus i.e the knowledge and its absence rests in the same locus[34]. 'Kṣaṇika' means that which ceases within three 'kṣaṇas'[35]. Hence the 'pratibandhakatva' for the contradictory knowledge is not possible. The author says that when the definite knowledge of the absence of fire exists, in the soul, at the same time there exists the absence of the same knowledge, and occurs the knowledge of the existence of that object[36].

Then the existence of the absence of the absence of definite knowledge (tadābhāvavatta niścayābhāva) by the relation of 'svarūpa' which is not limited by 'avyāpyavṛttitva' is to be considered as the cause of 'viśiṣṭajñāna'. There will be no defect if the 'kāraṇatva' for 'viśiṣṭajñāna' is accepted to the absence of contradictory knowledge (bādhajñānābhāva)

which exists in the soul by the relation of 'svarūpa'.

But this view is rejected because the absence of contradictory knowledge in the relation of 'svarūpa' exists in the form that it is limited by the space of body (śarīra rūpadeśāvacchinna) because we say that there exists the absence of contradictory knowledge in the soul through the 'avacchedaka' of body[37]. Moreover there exists nothing which is not limited by time (kāla) because time is the abode of all objects which are born[38]. Hence the 'prabandhakatva' for a 'viśiṣṭa jñāna' by the relation of 'samavāya' is attributed to that 'vaiśiṣṭya' which is qualified with the definiteness of contradictory knowledge[39]. The 'vaiśiṣṭya' is by the relation of 'sāmānādhikaraṇya' (in same locus). Hence the 'viśiṣṭabuddhi' which arise in the soul by the relation of 'samavāya' can be obstructed by the definiteness of contradictory knowledge which arise in that soul.

Āvalī III

The third āvalī contains fifty four jewels of 'naca-s' and it begins with a discussion about the nature of 'pratibadhyatā' in the 'Pragalbhalakṣaṇa'.

1. Nature of Pratibadhyata

The clarified definition of 'vyāpti' can be considered according to

SS-'yatsamānādhikaraṇa sādhyābhāvapramāyām sādhyavattā jñānaniṣṭha pratibadhyatā nirūpakatvam' - 'vyāpti' is the state in which valid knowledge of the absence of 'sādhya' as existing in the locus of 'hetu' is not the describer (anirūpaka) of the 'pratibadhyata' existing in the 'sādhyavattājñāna'. Then the author shows an 'Ativyāpti' in this definition by the concept that the 'kāminijijñāsā kāyamātram prati pratibandhakam' - anxiety in woman affairs in obstructive for the accomplishment of all effects[40]. In the invalid inference of smoke from fire on the red hot iron ball (ayogolakam dhūmavad vahnimatvād) the 'sādhyavattājñāna' is that, there is smoke in the iron ball by the relation of 'samyoga' and it is obstructed by 'kāminijijñāsā'. So the 'pratibadhyatā' described by the 'pratibandhakata' of 'kaminijijñāsā' exists in that knowledge. The 'sādhyabhāvapramā', there is absence of smoke in the red hot iron ball is not the describer (anirūpaka) of the 'pratibadhyata'. So the application of the definition is possible in that inference. The 'Ativyāpti' is solved by the opinion that the 'sādhyavattājñāna' should be viewed by inserting the relation (sambandha) of the limitor of the 'pratiyogita' existing in the 'pratiyogi' of 'abhāva'[41]. So in the example noted above the relation of 'pratiyogitāvacchedaka' is contact (samyoga) and the 'sādhyavattajñāna' existence of smoke cannot be approved as resting in the red hot iron ball through that relation. Hence there occur 'pratibandhakatva' for the

'sādhyābhāvapramā' and the defect can be solved.

Another 'Ativyāpti' is shown by approving 'svarūpa' as the relation. For example the 'sādhyavattājñāna' is that there exists smoke (dhūmavān), the absence of the absence of smoke - 'dhumābhāvābhāva' denotes the smoke itself and it exists by the relation of 'svarūpa' because it is in the nature of an absence. The 'sādhyavattajñāna' is not obstructed by the 'sādhyabhāva pramā'. Hence a clarification is done which is in the nature of a group (kūṭa) which includes all the relations[42]. In the inference, 'The Iron ball has smoke as there exists fire', the general absence of smoke (dhūmasāmānyābhāva) in the locus of hetu (iron ball) does not include in this group of 'pratibandhakābhāva'. The relations of 'abhāvapratiyōgitāvacchedaka' in the content of 'sādhyābhāvapramā', are two i.e 'samyoga' and 'svarūpa'. The 'sādhyavattajñāna' (existence of smoke) was not obstructed through the relation of 'svarūpa' by the 'sādhyābhāvapramā' but the relation of 'pratibandhakābhāva', also includes 'samyoga' in the group and there is obstruction by the relation of 'samyoga' and there is no room for 'Ativyāpti'.

Another 'Asambhava' is shown for the definition in the inference. The mountain has fire as there is smoke because the 'pratibadhyatā' is considered as 'vyāpaka'. Then the 'sādhyavattajñāna vyapaka' is

considered in the form of 'mountain possesses fire with potness' (ghaṭatva viśiṣṭa vahniman). Then the knowledge that there is absence of fire with potness can obstruct the previous knowledge which is in the nature of 'ghatatvena vahnimān' because there exists the 'vyāpakatva' of the 'pratibadhyata' in the nature of 'pratibadhyatātva'[43]. So the application of the definition is not possible and occur 'Asambhava'. Then another clarification is that the 'vyāpakatva' of the 'pratibadhyata vyakti' is viewed by the relation – 'svāvacchedaka viṣayitā'. Then also the 'Asambhava' in the inference. 'Mountain possess fire as there is smoke' cannot be solved because the 'sadhyābhāvavattājñāna' is that there is absence of fire with potness, and 'sādhyavattā jñāna' is that, the mountain possesses fire and possesses fire qualified with potness. The 'pratibadhyatā vyakti vyāpakatva', is in the form of mountain has fire and has fire limited with potness. So there is two 'pratibadhyatā-s' one is that knowledge, described by the knowledge that there is absence of fire with potness, and the other is that described by the knowledge of the absence of fire. Then there is unity in the 'pratibadhyatva vyakti' and 'svarūpa' so the 'pratibhadhyatāvacchedaka' described by the knowledge of 'the absence of fire limited with potness' exists in the common 'viṣayita' of the mountain with fire. So there is obstruction to the 'sādhyābhāvapramā' and occur 'Asambhava'[44].

Then the 'sādhyavattājñānatvāvacchinnatva' is viewed not in the nature of 'vyāpakatva' but as limited by the 'svarūpa sambandha', then also 'Asambhava' cannot be solved. For instance in the example mountain has fire as it has smoke, the 'sādhyābhāvaprama' is that there is absence of fire limited with potness and 'pratibadhyatā' described by this knowledge, is that there is the existence of fire qualified with fireness and potness. So the 'pratibandhakatva' described by such 'pratibadhyata' exists in the knowledge of the absence of fire limited with potness. So there occur 'Asambhava'. This defect is solved by the insertion of 'paryāpti' to the 'pratibadhyata'. The knowledge with the qualifier 'sādhyatāvacchedaka paryāpta', is that the mountain possess fire with fireness, not that it possess fire with fireness and potness. So the 'asambhava' can be solved[45].

2. Nature of Sāmagrīpratibandhakatāvacchedaka

The next topic discussed in the NRM is the nature of 'pratibandhakatāvacchedaka' where there are the causes for the production of different kinds of knowledge. When there exists the causes for perception and inference in the same object, it is accepted that the causes of perception are stronger and will obstruct the inference. Similarly the 'vyadhikaraṇa dharmāvacchinnābhāva' also is capable to obstruct

the 'sādhyavattānumiti' as it is a factor of the 'pratyakṣa sāmagrī' in the case of same object. So there is 'Asambhava' for the definition of 'vyāpti'. The reply to this objection is that the 'vyadhikaraṇadharmāvacchinnābhāva' is a factor of the 'sāmagrī' but there is some difference in it. The 'pratibandhakatva' occurs to the 'vyadhikaraṇadharmāvacchinnābhāva' is in the form of the definite knowledge of the 'viśeṣanatāvacchedaka' which is qualified with the definite knowledge of 'viśeṣyatāvacchedakaprakāra'.. along with the contact of visual organ. Hence the obstruction can be solved by inserting the term 'jñānavaiśiṣṭyānavacchinnatva' for the 'pratibandhakatva'[46]. But 'pratibandhakatva' can be accepted even for the knowledge which is qualified with the 'viśeṣyatāvacchedaka prakāraka' along with the contact of the senses, and the definite knowledge of the 'viśeṣaṇatāvacchedaka-prakāra', which is 'jñānavaiśiṣṭyavacchinna', can do obstruction and occur 'Asambhava'. There is no proof to accept or reject any of the theories (vinigamakābhāvat) i.e 'Pratibandhakatva' exists only for that knowledge, limited with 'jñānavaiśiṣṭya', or for that 'not limited by jñānavaiśiṣṭya'. Hence the 'pratibandhakatva' for the 'vyadhikaraṇadharmāvacchinnābhāva' cannot be rejected and the 'Asambhava. is not solved by the insertion of 'jñānavaiśiṣṭyānavacchinnatva'[47].

Then SS suggests another way to reject the 'Asambhava'. He says that the 'Pratibandhakatva' for the 'sāmagri' is not to be considered in the form of, one qualified with another because this kind of assumption carries the technical defect called 'Gaurava' and there is no clear proof to consider which of them is 'viśeṣya' and 'viśeṣaṇa'. Similar is the case if the 'pratibandhakatva' is accepted to the group of each causes. So the 'vaiśiṣṭya' is accepted to that which is qualified with the result (phalaviśiṣṭatvena vaiśiṣṭyam). In accepting the meaning of root (ḍhātu) the same method is attributed so the 'vyāpāra' qualified with 'phala' (phalaviśiṣṭa vyāpāra) is the meaning of 'dhātu', not 'vyāpāra' or 'phala', and there is 'lāghava' that there is not the entrance of them separately. Hence the 'sāmagri' functions as 'jñānavaiśiṣṭyāvacchinna' and by the insertion of 'jñānavaiśiṣṭyānavacchinnatva' the 'pratibandhakatva' for 'vyadhikaraṇadharmāvacchinnābhāva' can be solved.

Further another defect is shown by the concept that if the causes for 'śabda' and 'anumiti' occur in the cases of same objects, the causes of 'śabda' is stronger and is capable to obstruct the 'anumiti'. The 'vyadhikaraṇadharmāvacchinnābhāva' which includes the 'yogyatā jñāna' etc,are the 'sāmagri' of 'śabda' and it is capable to obstruct the 'sādhyavattā jñāna' in the case of same objects. So another clarification is done[48].

Then an 'Asambhava' is shown through the knowledge of 'Īśwara' which is not having the 'vyāpakatva' in the 'pratibadhyata'. 'Pratibandhakatva' is the counterpositiveness of 'abhāva' which are being the causes (karaṇībhūtābhāvapratiyogitvam)[49]. The knowledge of God which is eternal has no causes. The defect is cleared with the insertion of the relation of 'viṣayitva' of the 'avacchedaka'. The 'viṣayitva' of 'pratibandhaka' exists in the human soul and that relation of the 'viṣayitva' of 'avacchedaka' is accepted in the knowledge of God. SS is of opinion that there is no proof to consider differences in the 'viṣayita-s' existing in the cognitions which are of common nature.

Then another 'Avyāpti' is shown in the inference of fire from smoke. The 'Avyāpti' is shown by the concept that the 'pratyakṣa' after doubt in the same objects can obstruct all other kinds of knowledge. For instance first there occur a knowledge that 'the mountain possesses smoke' and at the same time there is another 'viśeṣadarśana' that 'the mountain has the absence of fire limited by potness'. So this 'viśeṣadarśana' is the cause for a definite knowledge, i.e 'pratyakṣa' after doubt. Being the component of the 'sāmagri' of 'pratyakṣa' it is capable to obstruct all other cognitions. So there is 'Avyāpti'. But according to the author there is no need to consider 'viśeṣadarśana' as the cause of 'pratyakṣa'. But

'Pratibandhakatva' is accepted to the 'viparītaniścaya' along with the absence of 'viśeṣadarśana'. The absence of 'viparītaniścaya' is enough to produce the 'pratyakṣa'[50].

3. The Viśeṣadarśana - whether cause or stimulating factor for the pratyakṣa

The next topic as a continuation for the previous one is that whether the 'viśeṣadarśana' is the cause or stimulating factor (uttejaka) of 'pratyakṣa'. In our common experience the 'viśeṣadarśana' after doubt clears the doubts and then arises 'viśiṣṭajnāna'. For instance in the dim light one sees a tall object and doubts 'whether it is a pillar or a man' (sthānurva puruṣo va) because there exist the characteristic features similar to pillar and man. Then he sees the hands or movements in that object, which are the 'vyāpyadharma' or the specific characteristics of man and determines that it is a man not a pillar. So the definite knowledge after 'viparītajñāna' arises if there occur the 'vyāpyavattāniścaya' in that object[51].

There is another view that the definite perceptual knowledge will not arise after 'viparītaniścaya' (contradictory knowledge). So it is accepted that the contradictory knowledge is doing obstruction

(pratibandaka). The absence of obstruction (pratibandhakatvābhāva) is a common cause for the production of any effect. Hence the absence of contradictory knowledge, not the 'viśeṣadarśaṇa' is to be accepted as the cause for production of a definite knowledge. But there is another side for this view that in certain places even if there occurs the 'viparītajñāna', perceptual knowledge is produced after 'viśeṣadarśana'. Hence 'viparītaniścayābhāva' cannot be regarded as a cause for the production of perceptual knowledge.

Now there is scope for another objection that if the 'viparīta jñāna' is not regarded as the obstructive factor for the production of a definite knowledge the problem is that there will be the definite knowledge in the conch as 'it is white' even if there exists the 'viparītajñāna' that the conch is yellow. In this case the yellowness is cognised in the conch by the defects like distance jaundice etc. So these defects are to be accepted as 'pratibandhaka' for the cognition of whiteness in that conch. Hence 'viparītajñāna' which is produced by the contact of the same senses, not by 'jñānalakṣaṇa' should be approved as the 'pratibhandhaka' for 'pratyakṣa'[52]. Same is the opinion of 'Gangeśopādhyāya' - the author of the famous work 'Tattvacintāmaṇi' when he approves that the apprehension of 'viśeṣadarśana' is contradictory for the apprehension of invalid

knowledge. If the cognizer has a definite knowledge that the conch is not white and then occur the 'viśeṣadarśana', after the destruction of the causes of perception, a mental cognition (mānasa) may be accepted as "this conch is white" (śankha sweta). But the knowledge different from 'laukika niścaya' cannot be accepted as the 'pratibandhakatāvacchedaka' of the 'viparītaniścaya'. In the case of doubt as in the form of 'is it a pillar or a man (sthānurva puruṣo vā) the laukika niścaya' - it is a man not a pillar, is arised. First there occured the invalid knowledge that 'it is a pillar even after the contact of visual organ'. Then he sees the hands etc the specific properties and then the valid 'laukika niścaya' is produced. So the 'viśeṣadarśana' is to be accepted as a cause for the definite knowledge after invalid knowledge.

The author of NRM is of opinion that the 'viśeṣadarśana' is not to be accepted as a cause for definite perceptual knowledge. He approves 'pratibandhakatva' for a definite knowledge which is given in the form of a 'viśiṣṭābhāva' i.e. 'viparītajñāna' qualified with the absence of 'viśeṣadarśana' which is common for a doubt[53] and the absence of this 'pratibandhaka' is the cause for a definite perceptual knowledge. 'Viśeṣadarśana' is not needed as a cause for 'pratyakṣa'. The 'pratibandhakatvābhāva' will occur when there exists 'viśeṣadarśana' with

'viparītajñāna', 'viśeṣadarśanābhāva' with 'viparīta jñānābhāva', and when there is 'viśeṣadarśana' with 'viparīta jñānabhava'.

There exists another view that the acceptance of 'viśeṣadarśana' as a cause for a definite knowledge is simpler than assuming 'hetutva' to a 'viśiṣṭajñānābhāva'. But it is not acceptable because while considering 'vyāpti', the 'sambandha', 'vyāpyadarśana' etc are not similar in all inferences so the absence of 'viparītadarśana' is a cause which can be applied in all places. SS shows a 'gaurava' in accepting the absence of 'viparītadarśana' as a cause of perception that, it should be accepted as a pre-requisite even to a perception which is not produced after 'viparītajñāna'. The view of the author is given with the term 'vastutastu' in the beginning of a sentence[54] that there is no need to accept 'viśeṣadarśana' as a cause or a stimulating factor of 'pratyakṣa'. But the absence of 'viparītajñāna' can be accepted only as a 'prayojaka' and it can be included in the sāmagri for the production of any kinds of knowledge[55]. Similarly the 'viśeṣadarśana' also can be considered as a 'prayojaka' and all that comes in the side (koṭi) of 'prayōjaka' are not considered as causes. If it is insisted as a cause then the knowledge of cloth (paṭajñāna) which is different from the knowledge of pot (ghaṭajñāna) is to be accepted as produced only when there is the absence of the

'samagri' for 'ghatajnana'. So the knowledge of the absence of 'ghata samagri' can be accepted not as a cause but as a 'prayojaka' for the production of 'patajnana'. The valid perceptual knowledge does not take place after 'viparita jnana' because it do obstruction. So the acceptance of 'pratibandhakatva' to the 'viparitanisca' for a 'visistabuddhi' is easier.

4. The clarification to solve Ativyapti by the Ubhayabhava

In the invalid inference 'Iron ball has smoke as there is fire', the 'sadhyabhava prama' is that there is absence of smoke in the red hot iron ball and this knowledge obstructs the 'sadhyavattajnana' that there is smoke in the iron ball. Hence there is no 'Ativyapti' as the application of the definition of 'vyapti' is not possible in the invalid inference. But according to Nyaya theory there is a concept called 'ubhayabhava' - in which we can say that if there exists only one entity there exists the absence of two entities. For example if a pot is resting on the ground, we can say that there is the absence of 'pot and cloth' because two objects does not exist there. Similarly in the inference of smoke from fire on the red hot iron ball, it can be said that there exists the absence of two i.e 'pratibandhakatva' along with potness (pratibandhakatva ghatobhayabhavah) in the red hot iron ball, so the application of the definition can be done like this the 'sadhyabhava prama' in the red hot

iron ball is that there is the absence of smoke. It is 'pratibandhaka' for the 'sādhyavattājñāna' i.e the existence of smoke. But the valid knowledge in the form of 'ubhayābhāva' is that there exists the absence of 'pratibandhakatva' with potness. This 'sādhyābhāva pramā' is not obstructive to the 'sādhyavattājñāna' that there exists smoke. So there is 'Ativyāpti' for the definition to the invalid knowledge[56].

The defect, 'Ativyāpti' is solved by a modification that the 'sādhyābhāvaprama' which prohibits (pratibandaka) the 'sādhyavattājñāna' should be taken in a specific form i.e with a counterpositive having the 'paryaptāvacchedaka' of 'pratibandhakatva'. The counterpositiveness of 'ubhayābhāva' exists in the 'pratibandhakatva', 'ghaṭatva' and 'ghaṭobhayatva'. So it can be avoided as it is not resting in the 'pratibandhakatva' alone. Hence in the invalid inference of smoke from fire, the absence of smoke in the red hot iron ball is taken as the 'pratibandhaka' and this knowledge obstructs the 'sādhyavattājñāna' that there is smoke so there is no scope for 'Ativyāpti'.

5. Alternate definition

As the last topic in the NRM, SS proposes an alternate definition with clarifications. The definition for 'vyāpti' in the original text is given

as "yatsamānādhikaraṇa, sādhyābhāvapramāyām, sādhyavattājñāna pratibandhakatvam nāsti tattvam", and according to this definition the 'pratibandhakatvābhāva' is attributed to the general valid knowledge (pramāsāmanye). But the alternate definition of vyāpti is "yatsamānādhikaraṇa sādhyābhāvavanniṣṭa prameeya prakāratā nirūpita hetumanniṣṭa viṣayātasāmanye, svāvaccedakavācchinna viśeṣyatāka sādhyavattājñāna sāmanya pratibandhakatāvacchedakābhāva"[57]. In this definition the 'pratibandhakatāvacchedakatvābhāva' for the 'sādhyavattajñāna sāmanya' is attributed to the 'viśeṣyatā sāmānya' which exists in the locus of 'hetu' and described by the 'prameeya prakāratā' which exists in the 'sādhyābhāva'. So in our typical example the 'pratibandhakatāvacchedakatvābhāva' exists as a qualifier in the locus of 'hetu' i.e in mountain and the knowledge that there exists the absence of pot with fireness in the mountain which is a valid cognition has not the obstructive capacity for the 'sādhyavattājñāna' that, there is fire in the mountain. Hence the absence of obstruction (pratibandhakatvābhāva) is given to the viśeṣyatā sāmānya. SS is of opinion that this definition is comprehensive and simpler from the other definition. The simplicity is that there is no need for inserting two qualifiers[58].

There is no Ativyāpty for the definition in the inference

"Ayogolakam dhūmavad vahnimatvād". The knowledge that the 'ayogolaka' is qualified with the absence of smoke is always obstructive to the knowledge of the existence of smoke. The 'viśeṣyata' existing in the 'ayogolaka' is described by the 'prameeya prakāratā' i.e the absence of smoke which resides in the 'ayogolaka'. So this valid knowledge ie absence of smoke (dhumābhāva) as a 'prakāra' is considered to be the limitor of 'pratibandhakatva'. This 'viśeṣyatā' is also included in the 'sāmānya' as per the definition, and there is not the absence of 'pratibandhakata' described by the 'pratibadhyata' of the 'sādhyavattajñāna' in the 'viśeṣya' (ayogolaka).

Another 'Avyāpti' is shown in the inference "Dravyam guṇakarmabhedaviśiṣṭa sattvād". The assumption of 'bhedapratiyogitva' existing in the locus of 'hetu' i.e the 'bhedapratiyogitva' existing in the locus of a qualified generality is heavier than the assumption of the 'bhedapratiyogitva' existing in 'dravya'. The 'abhāva' whose counterpositive is limited with a heavier property is not acceptable and the definition cannot be applicable to that valid inference. So the 'pratiyogitā's' are to be viewed individually i.e the 'pratiyogita' which is described by the difference existing in the locus of 'hetu'. Hence the 'pratiyogita' is taken by nature of individualness (tadvyaktitvena). Further

it is said that the 'avacchedaka' can be considered as a term of 'pāribhāṣika' but then that may again needs clarifications and will occur 'Anavasthā'. If the absence limited with the 'avacchedaka' of each 'pratiyogitā' which is described by the difference existing in the locus of 'hetu' is accepted, then the cognition of 'pratiyogitāvacchedaka' in numerous individuals is not possible. So the 'samūhālambanānyatva' is to be added to solve the 'Avyāpti'. Then 'Ativyāpti' can be shown in the 'vyabhicāri hetu'. At last SS says that creating fallible places and detecting defects are easy in any inference but it is not advisable because then there will not be an end to the arguments and there will not have possibilities to reach the determination[59].

SS ends the work with a 'Mangalasloka' in which he prays 'Śri-Parameswara' to give happiness for ever to those scholars who study this 'Nacaratnamālikā', which is surrendered to adorn the chest of 'Śri-Parameswara' shining with numerous and new pecularities[60].

References:

1. Nacaratnamālika introductory part - "Paramamūlam"

2. साध्याभावश्च पूर्वोक्तद्वितीयरीत्या प्रत्येतव्यः Dīdhiti, Jagadiśa vyadhikaranam, Chankaniba Sanskrit series - 1958, p-142

3. यत्समानाधिकरणानां साध्यतावच्छेदकावच्छिन्न व्यापकतावच्छेदकरूपावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगितानां यावतामभावानां प्रतियोगितावच्छेदकावच्छिन्न सामानाधिकरण्यम् तत्वम् वा तत् । Ibid, p-91

4. T.C. part II, p-43

5. यत्समानाधिकरण साध्याभावप्रमासामान्ये इत्यर्थः तेन धूमवान् वह्नेरित्यादौ व्यधिकरणधर्मावच्छिन्न साध्याभावप्रमाव्यक्तेः साध्यवत्ताज्ञानाविरोधित्वेऽपि साध्यसामान्याभावप्रमाया एव साध्यवत्ताज्ञान विरोधितया नातिव्याप्तिः - Jāgadiśi, p-135

6. व्यधिकरणधर्मावच्छिन्न साध्याभावस्य साध्यसामान्याभावत्वभ्रमदशायां पर्वतो न वह्निमानित्याकरकतद्बुद्धेः साध्यवत्ताज्ञानविरोधित्वादसम्भवः इत्यतः प्रमात्वेपादानम् - Ibid, p-136

7. अत्र साध्यतावच्छेदक सम्बन्धेन साध्यतावच्छेदक रूपेण च साध्यवत्ता ज्ञानं बोध्यम् । तेन पर्वतः समवायसम्बन्धेन न वह्निमान् इति प्रमायाः समवायेन वह्निमत्ता बुद्धिं प्रति महानसीयवह्निमान्नेति प्रमायाश्च संयोगेन महानीसवह्निमता बोधं प्रति प्रतिबन्धकत्वेऽपि वह्निमान् धूमादित्यादौ नाव्याप्तिः । Ibid, p.p. - 139-140

8. श्रीमद्गुरुपदाम्भोजं नत्वा भूयो द्वितीयके
प्रगल्भलक्षणे किञ्चिदुच्यते शास्तृशर्मणा NRM, p-3

9. For explanation see infra, p.p.-118-120

10. तत्र व्यभिचारनिरूपकाधिकरणस्याधिकरणत्वस्य हेत्वधिकरणताभिन्नत्वाभावेन साध्याभाववतो घटादेरेव तादृशहेतुनिष्ठाधेयतानिरुपकत्वात् NRM, p-17

11. *नापि तृतीयः आधाराधेयभावयोराधाराधेयरूपत्वे वह्निमान् धूमादित्यादावव्याप्तेः* Ibid, p-18

12. *नहि हेतुतावच्छेदक धर्म सम्बन्धावच्छिन्नाधेयतात्वावच्छिन्ननिरूप्यताकाधिकरणत्वं विवक्ष्यते तच्च न ह्रदस्येति वक्तुं युक्तम्* Ibid, p.p. 18-19

13. See infra, p.p. - 111-112

14. *न च हेत्ववृत्तित्वेन अधिकरणताया विशेषणान्नाव्याप्तिरिति वाच्यम् एवं सति प्रमेयादि रूप सत्हेतावव्याप्तिः प्रमेयावृत्यधिकरणत्वाप्रसिद्धेः* NRM p-20

15. Ibid, p-20

16. Ibid, p-23

17. Ibid, p-23

18. See infra, p.p.- 126-127

19. *एवमपि विशिष्टप्रतियोगिकत्व विशिष्टसमवायस्य शुद्धसमवायस्य चैक्येन शुद्धसमवायस्यापि हेतुतावच्छेदकसम्बन्धतया हेतुतावच्छेदकावच्छिन्नत्वनिवेशे पूर्वोक्ताव्याप्तेदुर्वारत्वात्* NRM, p-24

20. See infra, p.p. - 122-124

21. *यतो विशिष्टवैशिष्ट्यावगाहिज्ञाने सर्वत्र विशेषणस्य शुद्धसम्बन्धेन भानम्, विशेषणतावच्छेदकस्यापि धर्मिपारतन्त्र्येण विशेषण धर्मिणि भानमुपेयते। अत एव विशेष्ये विशेषणमिति रीत्या जायमानज्ञानात् विशिष्टवैशिष्ट्यावगाहि ज्ञानस्य वैलक्षण्यम्।* NRM, p-26

22. *केचित्तु सामान्यधर्मावच्छिन्नाधारत्वाधेयत्वाधेयत्वयोरतिरिक्तत्वाद्वह्निमान् धूमादित्यादौ धूमनिष्ट द्रव्यत्वावच्छिन्नाधेयतानिरूपित द्रव्यत्वाद्यवच्छिन्नाधिकरणतावत्वं ह्रदस्यापीत्यव्याप्त्यापत्या आधेयतायां हेतुतावच्छेदकावच्छिन्नत्वनिवेशनमावश्यकम्* - Ibid, p-27

23. *यत्समानाधिकरणेत्यादि लक्षणवाक्यम्, तत्र यस्य समानं यत्समानं, यत्समानमधिकरणं यस्येति विग्रहः* NRM, p-1

24. *अथ हेत्वधिकरणनिष्ठत्वं किं हेत्वधिकरणनिरूपिताधेयतारूपम्, किं वा हेत्वधिकरणनिष्ठाधिकरणता-निरूपिताधेयतारूपं वा विवक्षितम्* NRM, p-53

25. *नाद्यः किञ्चिदवच्छिन्नत्वे साध्येऽधिकरणतात्वहेतावव्याप्तेः हेत्वधिकरणीभूता या घटादिनिष्ठवच्छिन्नत्वा-भावाधिकरणता तन्निरूपिताधेयत्वस्य साध्याभावसाधारण्यात्।* Ibid, p-53

26. *नापि द्वितीयः वृत्तित्वाभावे साध्ये शब्दाश्रयत्वादिति हेतावव्याप्तेः, हेत्वधिकरणनिष्ठा या प्रमेयत्वाद्यधिकरणता तन्निरूपकत्वस्य आधेयत्वात्मक साध्याभावे सत्वात्* Ibid, p-53

27. *हेत्वधिकरणीभूत यद्व्यक्तिनिरूपितत्वं स्वस्मिन् तत्व्यक्तिनिष्ठाधिकरणता निरूपिता या आधेयता तद्वत्वस्य हेत्वधिकरणविशिष्टाधेयतावत्पर्यवसितस्यं* Ibid, p-54

28. *स्वाश्रयत्वस्वावच्छेदकत्वोभयसम्बन्धेन हेत्वधिकरणविशिष्ट पर्याप्ताधिकरणतानिरूपिताधेयत्वरूपम्* Ibid, p-63

29. *एकमात्रवृत्तिधर्मस्य पर्याप्त्यनभ्युपगमे अधिकरणताविशिष्ट पर्याप्तत्वस्थाने उक्तोभयसम्बन्धावच्छिन्ना-धिकरणताव्याप्यत्वमपि कारणतायां देयमिति सर्वं सुस्थम्* Ibid, p-64

30. See Nyayasiddhāntamuktāvalī, Anumanakhandha, p-216

31. NRM, p-72

32. TC Part II, p-54

33. *अव्याप्यवृत्तिक्षणिको विशेषगुण इष्यते* NSM, karika 27

34. *स्वात्यन्ताभाव समानाधिकरणत्वमव्याप्यवृत्तित्वम्* Tarkasangraha, p-17

35. *क्षणिकत्वं तृतीयक्षणवृत्तिध्वंसप्रतियोगित्वम्* NSM, p-97

36. *जन्यज्ञानस्याव्याप्यवृत्तितया तदभाववत्तानिश्चयकाले तदभावसत्वेन तद्वत्ताबुद्ध्यापत्तेरवारणात्* NRM, p-104

37. *बाधज्ञानशून्यकालावच्छिन्नविशेषणताया अपि शरीररूपदेशावच्छिन्नत्वात्, इदानीमेत-च्छरीरावच्छेदेनात्मनि बाधबुद्धिर्नास्तीत्याकारकप्रत्ययात्* Ibid, p-107

38. जन्यानां जनक कालः जगतामाश्रयो मतः NSM, karika - 45

39. अत समवायेन विशिष्टबुद्धिं प्रति बाधनिश्चयविशिष्टत्वेनैव प्रतिबन्धकत्वं वक्तव्यम्, वैशिष्ट्यञ्च सामानाधिकरणसम्बन्धेन। तथा च बाधनिश्चयकालेऽन्यावच्छेदेन तदभावसत्वेऽपि न तद्विशिष्टस्याभावः NRM, p-119

40. अथ संयोग समवायादि नाना संसर्गक साध्यवत्ताज्ञानत्वव्यापिका कामिनीजिज्ञासादि प्रतिबध्यतैव, तदनिरूपकत्वञ्च साध्याभावप्रमासामान्यस्येत्यतिव्याप्तिः NRM, p-140

41. न च स्वविषयीभूताभावप्रतियोगितावच्छेदक सम्बन्ध संसर्गक साध्यवत्ताज्ञानविवक्षणान्नातिव्याप्तिरिति वाच्यम् Ibid, p-140

42. यत्समानाधिकरणसाध्याभावप्रमासामान्ये स्वविषयीभूताभावप्रतियोगितावच्छेदकीभूताः ये ये सम्बन्धाः प्रत्येकं तत्तत्संर्गक साध्यवत्ता ज्ञानत्वव्यापक प्रतिबध्यतानिरूपित प्रतिबन्धकत्वाभावकूढस्य विवक्षितात्वात् Ibid, p-141

43. घटत्वविशिष्टवह्निमान् पर्वत इति निश्चयनिष्टया घटत्वेन वह्न्यभाववानिति ज्ञानप्रतिबध्यताया अपि प्रतिबध्यतात्वादिना व्यापकत्वादसम्भवः Ibid, 141

44. स्वावच्छेदकविषयितासम्बन्धेन प्रतिबध्यताव्यक्तेः व्यापकत्वविवक्षणे पर्वतो वह्निमान् घटत्वविशिष्टवह्निमांश्चेति ज्ञाननिष्टयोः प्रतिबध्यव्यक्त्योः प्रतिबध्यस्वरूपयोरैक्येन घटत्वेन वह्न्यभाववान् पर्वत इति निश्चयनिरूपितप्रतिबध्यतवच्छेदकत्वस्य वह्निमत्पर्वतविषयिता सामान्येऽप्यक्षतत्वादसम्भवतादवस्थ्यम्। Ibid, 141

45. न च स्वरूपसम्बन्धावच्छिन्नत्व निवेशेप्यसम्भवः घटत्वविशिष्टवह्निमानिति ज्ञाननिष्टाया घटत्वेन वह्न्यभाववानिति प्रमानिरूपित प्रतिबध्यतायापि वह्नित्वघटत्वोभयावच्छिन्नप्रकारताशालि बुद्धित्वावच्छिन्नतया साध्यवत्ताबुद्धित्वावच्छिन्नापायदिति वाच्यम् साध्यतावच्छेदक पर्याप्तावच्छेदकता प्रकारताशालि बुद्धित्वावच्छिन्नत्वस्यैवात्र विवक्षणेन तादृश प्रतिबध्यताव्यावृत्तेः Ibid, p-144

46. न च व्यधिकरणधर्मावच्छिन्न साध्याभावप्रमाया उक्तिरीत्या प्रत्यक्षसामग्री घटकत्वेऽपि तादृशसामग्र्या इन्द्रियसन्निकर्ष सहित विशेष्यतावच्छेदक प्रकारकनिर्णय विशिष्ट विशेषणतावच्छेदक निर्णयत्वादिनैव प्रतिबन्धकतया ज्ञानवैशिष्ट्यानवच्छिन्नत्व विशेषणत्वेनैव तत्व्यावृत्तिरिति वाच्यम् Ibid, p-156

47. एवमपि विनिगमनाविरहेण विशेष्यतावच्छेदकप्रकारक ज्ञान विशिष्टेन्द्रियसन्निकर्ष सहित विशेषणतावच्छेदक प्रकारक निश्चयत्वेनापि प्रतिबन्धकत्वस्यावश्यकतयास्तदव्यावृत्तेः Ibid, 156

48. न चैवमपि समानविषयक शाब्दसामग्री प्रतिबन्धकतामादाय तदवच्छेदककोटौ योग्यताज्ञानादेः प्रवेशावश्यकतया व्यधिकरणधर्मावच्छिन्नसाध्याभावप्रमाया अपि तादृशज्ञानविधया तद्घटकत्वादिति वाच्यम्। स्वरूपस्वावच्छेदकीभूत भेदप्रतियोगित्वान्यतर सम्बन्धेन साध्यवत्ताज्ञानत्वव्यापकत्वस्य प्रतिबध्यतायां विवक्षणेन सामग्री प्रतिबन्धकताव्यावृत्तेः Ibid, p.162

49. NSM Dinakari of Dinakarabhatta, p-39

50. एवमपि वह्निव्याप्य धूमवत्पर्वतकालीन घटत्वेन वह्न्यभाववान् पर्वत इत्यादि प्रमाया अपि विशेषदर्शनविधया संशयोत्तरप्रत्यक्षं प्रति हेतुत्वेन प्रत्यक्षसामग्रीघटकत्वावश्यकतया समानविषयक प्रत्यक्षसामग्रीघटकत्वावश्यकतया समानविषयक प्रत्यक्षज्ञानप्रतिबन्धकतामादायाव्याप्तेर्दुर्वारत्वादितिचेन्मैवम्, विशेषदर्शनाभावविशिष्ट संशयसाधारण विपरीतज्ञानस्य प्रतिबन्धकत्वस्वीकारेणैवोपपत्तौ तत्र विशेषदर्शनहेतुताया एवाप्रामाणिकत्वात्। NRMp-165

51. अतो अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां विपरीतज्ञानानन्तर प्रत्यक्षनिश्चयत्वावच्छिन्नं प्रति ग्राह्यव्याप्यवत्तानिश्चयत्वेन हेतुत्वं कल्प्यते Ibid, p-167

52. तदास्तु प्रत्यक्षे समानेन्द्रिय जन्योपनीत भानभिन्न विपरीतनिश्चयस्य प्रतिबन्धकत्वम् - Ibid, p-167

53. विशेषदर्शनाभावविशिष्ट संशयसाधारण विपरीतज्ञानत्वेन विशिष्टबुद्धिं प्रति प्रतिबन्धकतयैवोपपत्तेस्तत्हेतुत्वानावश्यकत्वात् Ibid, p-169

54. वस्तुतस्तु विशेषदर्शनस्य हेतुत्वमुत्तेजकत्वं वा नावश्यकम् Ibid, p-172

55. अथैवमप्यतिव्याप्ति, समानाधिकरणधर्मावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताक साध्याभाव प्रमायामपि तादृश प्रतिबन्धकत्व घटत्वोभयाभावस्य सत्वात् Ibid, p-174

56. Ibid, p-178

57. *समूहालम्बनभिन्नत्वस्य स्व समान धर्मितावच्छेदक साध्यवत्ताज्ञान प्रतिबन्धकतावच्छेदक साध्यवत्ताज्ञान प्रतिबिन्धकतावच्छेदक विषयितानिरूपकावच्छेदकावच्छिन्नविषयकत्वस्य वाऽनिवेशनीयतया लाघवात्।* Ibid, p-178

59. *तत्र अप्रामाणिक स्थलविशेषं परिकल्प्य दूषणाभिधाने प्रायशः सर्वत्रैव तत्सम्भवेनासामग्जस्यापत्तेः* Ibid, p-197

60. *वक्षस्थले बालशशाङ्कमौलेः समर्पितेयं नचरत्नमाला*
नवैर्लसन्ती विविधैर्विशेषैश्चिरं विधत्तां विबुध प्रमोदम्, p- 197

CHAPTER V
NACARATNAMĀLIKĀ - AN ANALYSIS

It has been pointed out earlier that the language adopted in the text is that of 'Navya Nyāya' and the treatment of subjects is by adopting the model of 'kroḍapatra'. By an analysis of the text many other peculiarities can be noted. The structure of the text rests on the interpretation of the terms contained in the second 'pragalbhalakṣaṇa' of 'vyāpti'. But the aim of the author to write this book is not to give an interpretation for a 'vyāpti lakṣaṇa' because this definition had been discussed by many eminent previous commentators of 'Tattvacintāmaṇi' and it is found to be enough for the readers. The author accepts a new approach to the interpretation of the definition i.e by a logical enquiry he detected a number of objections while explaining each of the meaning of the terms which form the definition.

The continuity for the interpretation is created by a technique called 'Ankura kalpana' which is of much importance in 'Navya Nyāya'. The word 'Ankura' literally means a 'sprout' but the literal meaning of the word is not taken here by the 'Navya Naiyāyika-s', though upto a certain extent, a shade of the literal meaning continues to pervade the theory

underlying the technique of 'Ankura'. Just as a sprout may come out of a seed in any suitable place which may not always be noted, similarly there may be a particular point in a particular subject, though unnoticed in the ordinary course may be referred to in connection with the logical analysisof certain facts and ideas.

The author of 'Nacaratnamālikā' has taken into consideration many ideas unnoticed by any other commentator to discuss the definition and to elucidate the subject matter all comprehensive and flawless. The angle of vision is diverted to may sides and made the definition flawless when viewed from further angles.

The idea underlying this kind of assumption is that even the very remote possibilities of the existence of defects are to be taken into consideration. So many objections regarding the definition is invented by the author through the process of his own imagination. Each explanation of the term in the definition is modified in accordance with the reply to that objections. These solutions are offered by considering the objections one by one. The Nacaratnamālikā is full of such 'Naca-s' which are objections and clarifications to those objections.

I. Devotion to the teachers and Lord Śiva

The text begins and ends with Mangala slokas. In the Mangalasloka seen in the beginning of the text the author gives obescience to the lotus feet of his teacher, who may be his direct teacher Godavarma Bhattan Tampuran or the indirect teachers like Raghunātha śiromaṇi, Mahādeva bhaṭṭa etc. As the conventional practice the invocation is done for the destruction of obstacles that may occur while writing the book, and thereby the work can be completed successfully. In the last Mangalaśloka it is stated that the text - a chain of jewels with naca's having many peculiarities, is submitted in the chest of Lord Śiva and prays to that Lord to give happiness in the minds of the eminent readers[1]. As the author is an orthodox follower of all ritual practices and a staunch devotee of Lord Śiva, it is relevant that, what he had done would be considered by the grace of this Lord and it is surrendered to that Lord.

II. Mode of presentation of ideas

The definition of 'Vyāpti' is not given in the text fully and the application of it is also not done. The author gives the explanation of each of the terms contained in the definition with divergent models. It is also notable that the explanations are given in a model by which many

objections can be detected by the logical analysis. This is the reason for further solutions and modifications.

Some concepts applied in the text

The author applies all his skill for detecting defects in the explanations, with different concepts of 'Navya Nyāya'. The entire edifice of 'Navya Nyāya' is founded by certain concepts. They are numerous and are frequently used in all the discussions regarding the problems of 'Navya Nyāya'. Even then some of these concepts used by the author of NRM may be noted below.

1. प्रकारताविशेष्यतयोरिवाधारत्वाधेयत्वयोरपि परस्परं निरूप्यनिरूपक भावः ।[2]
2. विशिष्टप्रतियोगिकत्वविशिष्टसमवायस्य शुद्धसमवायस्य चैक्यः ।[3]
3. सामान्यधर्मावच्छिन्नाधारत्वाधेयत्वयोरतिरिक्तत्वम् ।[4]
4. वृत्यनियामकसम्बन्धेन व्याप्तेः अनभ्युपगमः ।[5]
5. समानाकारकज्ञानेषु विषयिताभेदः अप्रामाणिकः ।[6]
6. एकव्यक्तिधर्मस्य पर्याप्त्यनभ्युपगमः ।[7]
7. कामिनीजिज्ञासा कार्यमात्रं प्रति प्रतिबन्धकम् ।[8]
8. भिन्नविषयकशाब्दसामग्र्या प्रत्यक्षसामग्र्यपेक्षया प्राबल्यम् ।[9]

9. समानविषयकप्रत्यक्षसामग्री स्वसमान धर्मितावच्छेदक साध्यवत्तानुमिति सामान्य प्रतिबन्धकः ।[10]

10. धर्मितानवच्छेदकस्यापि संसर्गांशे भानम् ।[11]

Among these, certain concepts may be explained here. The third one mentioned above i.e the 'ādhāratva' and 'ādeyatva' limited with common properties are different. To cite an example. In the inference "mountain has fire as it has smoke". The 'dravyatva' is a common property which exists in the smoke which is a 'dravya'. This 'dravyatva' exists in the lake which also is a 'dravya'. In the inference noted above the smoke which exists in the mountain is the 'ādheya' and the 'adheyatva' is limited with 'dravyatva' - the common property similarly lake is the 'ādhāra' in which something exists and this 'ādhāratva' is limited by 'dravyatva'. Even though both are limited with common property they are to be considered as different.

The author of 'Nacarathnamālikā' uses the concept while discussing the term 'yatsamānādhikaraṇa'. The 'Avyāpti' shown in our typical example is like this the locusness of the 'hetu' can be attributed even to the lake because the 'adhikaraṇa' limited by 'dravyatva' existing in the lake is described by the 'ādheyatva' limited with 'dravyatva' existing

in the smoke.[12] So the 'sādhyābhāvapramā' that there is absence of fire in the lake can obstruct the 'sādhyavattajñāna' i.e there exists fire. So the application of the definition cannot be done and to get out of that fault the 'hetutavacchedakāvacchinnatva' is inserted to the 'ādheyata'.

By the use of the same concept 'Avyāpti' is shown in the same inference in a different way. Here the 'adhikaraṇatā' existing in the mountain is taken as that limited with 'dravyatva' - the common property. The 'ādheyatā' existing in the fire which also limited with the 'dravyatva', is considered as different and it can be said that the 'adhikaraṇata' existing in the mountain, can be considered only as a locus limited with 'dravyatva' and this 'adhikaraṇatā' is described by the 'ādheyatā' - the absence of fire[13]. In short in the concept "dravyam vahnyabhāvavān" - the locus is taken as only an entity limited with the common property - 'dravyatva' and the 'adhikaraṇatā' existing in that locus is described by the 'ādheyata' ie the absence of fire because there is described describer relation between the 'ādhāratā' and 'ādheyatā'. So the notion - absence of fire can obstruct the knowledge that there is fire - the 'sādhyavattajñāna', and occur 'Avyāpti'. To solve the problem the insertion of the 'paryāpti' is applied by the author.

Another concept which is mentioned above, as the seventh one

is that the 'sāmagri' of 'śabda' is more stronger than the 'pratyakṣa sāmagri' in the case of knowledge in different objects (bhinnaviṣayaka). This concept is applied to point out 'Avyāpti' in the definition by attributing 'Pratibandhakatva' for 'Vyadhikaraṇa dharmāvacchinnābhāva'. This absence is a factor of 'śabda' by way of 'yogyatājñāna'. So the absence of fire limited with potness can obstruct the 'sādhyavattājñāna' - there is fire. In the 'Vyadhikaraṇadharmāvacchinnābhāva' there is the describerness (nirūpakatva) of the pratibhadhyatā existing in the 'pratyakṣa' which is limited with the limitor of 'sādhyata'[14]. So the 'Pratibadhyatā nirūpakatva' for the 'sādhyābhāva pramā' which is the definition of 'vyāpti' is not applicable in the valid inference and occur 'Avyāpti'.

Another concept is that when the 'sāmagri' of 'pratyakṣa' and the 'sāmagri' of other knowledge exists in the case of similar objects (samāna viṣayaka) then 'pratyakṣa' is stronger and so it can obstruct the knowledge which may be produced from the 'sāmagri' of 'sādhyavattānumiti'. The author apply this concept in the text to detect 'Avyāpti', that the 'vyadhikaraṇadharmāvacchinna pratiyogitakābhāva' in the form of the absence of pot limited by fireness - which is a qualified knowledge will occur when there is the definite knowledge of fire as it is a component of

the 'pratyakṣa sāmagri' so the 'sāmagri' of 'pratyakṣa' can obstruct the 'sādhyavattānumiti' viz. 'vahnimān' and occur 'Avyāpti'[15].

These concepts are applicable in the worldly affairs as well as in the śāstra. For instance when a man is seeing a thing, then suddenly a man shouts 'there the elephant comes', then the attention of that man is diverted to the 'śabda' because this 'sāmagri' is stronger than the 'pratyakṣa sāmagri', where the knowledge is of different objects. But in the case of same objects (samāna viṣayaka) the common experience is that the knowledge which is produced by the 'pratyakṣa sāmagri' is stronger. The knowledge arised from the sense object contact is considered as authoritative than any other knowledge.

Another concept which is used in the text is the 'kāminījijñāsā'. It is a common experience in the world that the interest in woman affairs is always obstructive to accomplish any other effect because those whose mind is always indulged in the affairs of ladies cannot listen to other affairs. The author of NRM uses even this concept to show 'Ativyāpti' in the inference, "The red hot iron ball has smoke as there is fire"[16]. In this inference the 'sādhyavattā jñāna' - there is smoke in contact relation is obstructed by the 'kāminījijñasa' - so there exists the 'pratibadhyatā'. The 'sādhyābhāvapramā sāmānya' is not described by this 'pratibhadhyata'

so the definition of 'vyāpti' - 'sādhyavattājñāna nistha pratibadhyatā nirūpakatva' exists in the 'sādhyābhāvaprama', of this invalid knowledge and occur 'Ativyāpti'.

The application of another concept - "The difference in the viṣayita for the samānakārakajñāna is not to be accepted" is done to include the knowledge of God[17] under the definition. The underlying idea of this concept is that the 'viṣayi' is that which is having a 'viṣaya' and 'viṣayitā' is the counterpart of 'viṣayatā'. 'Viṣayitā' is a relational property existing in the 'viṣayi'. The knowledge, desire, effort and aversion are primarily known as 'viṣayi' (content possessing) or 'saviṣayaka' categories. The cognition which occur in different persons are different but the property of that 'Viṣayi' i.e 'viṣayitā' is not different in the knowledge which are having the common form.

The definition of 'vyāpti' is clarified as 'sādhyavattājñā-navyāpakapratibadhyatā nirūpakatva' (for the sādhyābhāva pramā). The 'pratibadhyatā' and 'pratibandhakatva' are approved to those objects which are produced. So the knowledge of God which is eternal cannot be considered as the 'vyāpaka' of 'sādhyavattājñāna' for the 'pratibadhyata' and occur 'Asambhava'. So SS used a device that the relation of the 'viṣayitva' of the 'avacchedaka' is to be viewed in this knowledge, the

human knowledge which is produced have this condition of 'pratibadhyā pratibandhaka' and the relation of this 'viṣayitva' can be attributed to the knowledge of God and the 'vyāpakatva' can be attained. There is no proof to accept difference in the 'viṣayitā' of knowledge which are of same form.

III. Some devices used for modification

The author is an expert to solve the possible problems which are pointed out in the explanations by himself. We can see he had used superb intelligence to modify the explanation with the help of insertions. The insertion of 'tad bhinnatva' - different from that, is a common device used in the text. 'Samūhālambhanabhinnatva', 'jñānavaiśiṣṭyānavacchinnatva' are frequently seen to clarify the definition. 'Vinigamakābhāva', 'gaurava' etc are other devices adopted to reject the objections pointed out in the explanation.

The technique - Tad bhinnatva

The insertion of the technique 'tad bhinnatva' is a general device used in all the śāstra works, when the existence of a particular term or concept is the reason for the proposed defect. To cite an example from NRM while explaining the term "yatsamānādhikaraṇa" - three alternate

explanations are given. Among these explanations the second one is 'yanniṣṭādheyatānirūpakavṛttitva'. While accepting this interpretation a defect is pointed out by the author that the 'adhikaraṇatā' existing in the mountain - which is 'ādheyatā nirūpakā' - is not possessing the fire. So this 'sādhyabāvapramā' in the inference "mountain has fire as there is smoke" is that the 'adhikaraṇatā' of mountain is possessing the absence of fire and it can obstruct the 'sādhyavattājñāna' and occur 'Avyāpti'. Suddenly the insertion of the 'hetvadhikaraṇatā bhinnatva', is the solution proposed[18]. Sometimes these kinds of insertions are seen as a chain in this text. To cite an example, an 'Avyāpti' for the definition is shown in the inference of 'mountain possesses fire as there is smoke'. With the help of a 'samūhālambana jñāna' i.e 'Hrado vahnitvāvacchinna-pratiyogitaka vahnyabhāvavan, ghatatvena vahnyabhavavānśca'[19]. This defect is suddenly solved by the insertion 'samūhālambanabhinnatva' with the valid knowledge. Then next defect - 'Avyāpti' is pointed in this inference where the 'sādhyābhāvapramā' is in a form with two entities in one locus i.e 'hṛada' in possessing the absence of fire and the absence of pot limited with fireness (hṛado vahnyabhāvavān vahnitvena ghatā-bhāvavānśca). Then the solution proposed is to add 'bhramabhinnatva' (different from invalid knowledge) with the 'pratibadhyatā'. So the 'pratibadhyatā' existing in 'vahnimān hṛada' is invalid and it cannot be

obstructed. But then there is scope for another 'Ativyāpti' in the inference "The iron ball has smoke as there is fire". In this inference the 'sādhyābhāvapramā' is that there is absence of smoke in the iron ball and it prohibits the invalid knowledge that there is smoke in the iron ball. If the 'pratibadhyatā' cannot be accepted to an invalid knowledge then there will not be obstruction and the definition is applicable in that invalid inference. Hence another insertion to solve this defect, and thus the chain lengthens until to a stage in which further insertions are more misleading. In these examples the author used the devices which suit to that particular context as a sudden treatment (tatkāla śamana) to the problems.

Vinigamakābhāva

'Vinigamaka' refers to the existence of proof to approve a view and to deny the opposite view. If there exists two opinions about a subject, among them one side is having enough valid proofs to establish, and the other side is not having such proofs, then the opinion of the former is approved and the latter is rejected. But there are instances where there will not be enough proof in both sides to establish or deny. In such cases both the opinions are not accepted because of 'Vinigamakābhāva' (sādhaka bādhakapramāṇābhāvād).

SS uses this device occasionally as a verdict to deny both opinions. To cite an example from NRM - In the third explanation for the term 'yatsamānādhikaraṇa' an 'Avyāpti' is shown witht the help of the concept that "the ādhārata is to be considered as the form of ādhāra" and "the adheyata is to be considered as the form of ādheya". Then the problem occured is that if the 'ādheyatā' is considered as the form of 'ādheya' then the 'nirūpyatā' is also to be considered as the 'ādheyatā'. Then if the 'ādhāratā' is considered to be the form of 'ādhara' an 'Avyāpti' is pointed out in the inference "Abhāvaḥ guṇa śūnyatvavān bhāvabhinnatvād" - absence possesses the absence of quality as it is different from positive. So an opinion is put forward that the 'ādharatā' is to be regarded as different from the 'ādhāra' and the 'ādheyatā' is to be considered as in the form of 'ādheya'. SS holds that both the views cannot be accepted because there is no proof to approve or reject any side[21]. Another example is seen while discussing about the 'pratibandhakatva' for the 'vyadhikaraṇadharmāvacchinna sādhyābhāva-pramā'. There the 'pratibandhakatva' is solved by adding the 'jñāna-vaiśiṣṭyānavacchinnatva'. But the 'pratibandhakatva' can be attributed to the knowledge which is 'jñānavaiśiṣṭyāvacchinna'. As there is no proof to accept any of them 'vinigamakābhāvād' the 'avyāpti' is accepted as still existing in the inference[22].

Gaurava - It is a device commonly applied in the śāstra works to reject an idea. If there exist two possibilities that can be acceptable, among them one is simpler and the other is complicated, then the latter will not be accepted because of the technical defect called 'gaurava' (heaviness). The 'Gaurava' may be that producing difficulty for the body (śarīrakṛta) or by creating difficulties for assumption - (kalpanākṛta) which may contain more theories or concepts to get that particular idea. For instance the terms 'ghata' and 'kampugreevādimān' both denote the same object Pot. Then the 'avacchedakatva' is given to the simple term 'ghata' not to the latter because of the 'gaurava' for the body (śarīrakṛta) in the latter. The author of NRM uses this concept in many instances. To cite an example from the third āvali - the 'sāmānyāvacchinnatva' is not accepted to the 'sādhyavatta prakārata' because there is 'Gaurava' in assumption[23] (kalpanākṛta). The term 'sāmānya' refers a wider meaning and it again needs further clarifications and the body of the definition will become heavier. So the term 'jñāna' which is a component of 'sādhyavāttajñāna' is accepted in the meaning of 'sādhyavattānumiti'. Hence the definition is modified as 'sādhyavattānumitittva vyāpaka pratibadhyatānirūpakatva' (in the sādhyābhāvapramā).

These devices used by SS are seen in all the Śāstra works but

he applied these devices in numerous instances in the most suitable places. So SS can be considered as an expert in the application of these concepts since he had attained a thorough knowledge of these concepts from the study of numerous texts in the 'Navya Nyāya'.

IV. Some peculiar types of inferences

Certainly the author had to keep the sleep away for days and nights to find out inferences where the objections can be put forward. The defects pointed out in the inference. "Abhāva ghatatvābhāvavān, *svarūpasambandhāvacchinna ghata nirūpitādheyatvād is an example*"[24]. Another example is inference "dhūmādhikaraṇatābhinnaḥ dhūmādhikaraṇa dhūmādhikaraṇatva niṣṭhādheyatvaidadanyataratvād" Parikṣit Rāmavarma writes in the 'bhūmika' of NRM that this kind of objections in *peculier inferences are really amazing*[25] (vismayāvahameva). In certain places simple ideas are given with long interpretations to avoid ambiguity and to get maximum perfection. For instance the notions like "ghatatvena pata and ghatatvena patābhāva" are given like this, "ghatatvādiviśiṣta paṭādyabhāvavagāhijñana ghatatvādhyavacchinna patādiniṣta pratiyogitakābhāvaḥ"[26].

V. Views of earlier Naiyāyikas mentioned by Śāstṛśarman

The author is very conscious that his opinions may not be against the views of the previous commentators of 'Tattvacintāmaṇi' and the views of them are mentioned in the text as complimentary to his ideas.

The opinion of 'Gangeśopādhyāya' that 'Pratiyogyavṛttiśca dharmo na pratiyogitāvacchedaka'[27] is quoted while discussing the 'sādhyatāvacchedaka sambandhāvacchinnatva' for the counterpositive of 'vyadhikaraṇa sādhyābhāva'. Another view of Gengeśa that the apprehension of 'viśeṣa darśana' is contradictory for the apprehension of invalid knowledge is also quoted[28].

Raghunātha Śiromaṇi's opinion is taken as a support to accept 'pratibandhakatva' for 'vyadhikaraṇa dharmāvacchinna pratiyogitakābhava'. The apprehension of the absence of golden fire (kāñcanamaya vahnyabhāvavān) is accepted as 'pratibandhaka' for the apprehension of golden fire in the mountain. It is an example given by Raghunātha Śiromaṇi to the 'bādha hetvābhāsa' in which the 'vyadhikaraṇadharma' is doing obstruction for the 'anumiti'.

Gadādhara bhaṭṭācārya is mentioned in the discussion of the

'hetutāvacchedaka sambandha' in the inference where the hetu is a qualified generality. The author accepts pure 'samavāya' as the relation and quotes the opinion of Gadādhara that he also accepts the same relation while interpreting the inference "it is a substance as there is the generality which is different from that of 'guṇa' and 'karma'[29]. Then in another ocasion i.e while accepting of the relation of 'paryāpti' - the views of Gadādhara bhaṭṭa and Jagadīśa are mentioned[30].

VI. The author - a strong conventional

The author of 'Nacaratnamālikā' takes care that his views may not be against the transcendental beliefs that were prevalent in the society. The concepts like 'kāyavyūha, bhūtāveśa', 'parakāyapraveśa' are such mystic topics included in the text which got the sanction by dialectical argumentation. In the third āvalī there is a discussion about the 'pratibandhakatva' of contradictory knowledge to the apprehension of the existence of that knowledge. There is an opinion put forward by the author that the 'bādhajñānābhāva' which is not limited by space (deśānavacchinna) is to be accepted as the cause of 'viśiṣṭajñāna'. Then he suspects a defect if this idea is accepted. The defect is that - the 'kāyavyūha' is a concept that, the souls of sages etc with their yogic power accepts innumerable bodies at a time with a view to experience

their fruits of actions through that bodies simultaneously and can attain 'nisreyasa' as early as possible. Then the defect is that if the 'bādha buddhi' occurs in the soul through the limitor of one body, then there is not the existence of 'badhābhāva bhuddhi' in that soul which is not limited by the space, so there will not arise the qualified knowledge in that soul through the limitor of other bodies also[31]. Hence the 'pratibandhakatva' for 'bādhajñāna' is ascribed as per the limitors of each bodies[32]. Then another defect occurs that, when the whole body (mahāśarīra) of a man is destroyed by the loss of a hand, leg etc and then there exists only the 'khanḍha śarīra' (fragment of body). If that man had a 'bādhajñāna' through the limitor of whole body (mahā śarīrāvacchedena) and 'viśiṣṭa buddhi' can be attributed to that 'khandha śarīra' because there is no 'bādha buddhi' through the limitor of 'khanḍha śarīra'. So the soul alone is not considered as the cause of qualified knowledge but the 'khanḍhaśarīra' with other conditions are to be accepted as causes. If the 'avacchedakatva' is accepted to that which is not the abode of the 'sāmagri' then in the case of 'parakāya praveśa' i.e one's soul enters in the body of another man, then if the 'bādha buddhi' exists through the body which is abandoned, but there will have the qualified knowledge in the soul through the body which is accepted[33]. Moreover if one is possessed by a spirit - (bhūtāveśa), then if that man in whose soul the spirit entered, have a

'bādha buddhi', the spirit who is possessing the soul also will not have a qualified knowledge[34]. So the 'bādhajñāna' which exists in the same locus by the relation of 'samavāya' is to be approved as doing obstruction for the production of a qualified knowledge in that soul. In the case of 'kāyavyūha' if there is 'bādha buddhi' through the limitor of one body there will not arise the qualified knowledge in that soul through another limitor-s because there is no proof to establish it. If this idea is not aceptable then the 'avacchinnatva' of each bodies should be inserted in the side of limitor as there is no other option[35].

Main points noted from the analysis

1. Śāstṛśarman is a staunch devotee of his 'guru' and the 'Lord Śiva'. At the beginning and in the end of the text he remembers them and gives equal importance to both of them.

2. The mode of presentation in the text is peculiar and novel in the history of the Nyāya works from Kerala.

3. He has achieved his arguments by using the various devices and concepts of 'Navya Nyāya' and it seems that he is an expert for applying the suitable device in each objections to get out of the problems.

4. The model of analysis he adopted is full of dialogues, arguments and replies which resembles the mode of 'Vākyārtha vicāra' in the 'Śāstra sadas'.

5. In dealing the subjects he is a strong rationalist as well as conventional.

6. The author has full respect to the earlier commentators of 'Tattvacintāmaṇi' and their views are used as supportive to establish his views.

References:

1. Nacaratnamālika, p-197
2. Ibid, p-18
3. Ibid, p-24
4. Ibid, p-56
5. Ibid, p-51
6. Ibid, p-163
7. Ibid, p-63
8. Ibid, p-140
9. Ibid, p-145
10. Ibid, p-149
11. Ibid, p-181
12. *केचित्तु सामान्य धर्मावच्छिन्नाधारत्वाधेयत्वयोरतिरिक्तत्वात् वह्निमान् धूमादित्यादौ धूमनिष्ट द्रव्यत्वाद्यवच्छिन्नाधेयतानिरूपित द्रव्यत्वाद्यवच्छिन्नाधिकरणतावत्वं ह्रदस्यापीत्यव्याप्ता आधेयतायां हेतुतावच्छेदकावच्छिन्नत्वमावश्यकम्* Ibid, p-27
13. *द्रव्यत्वाद्यवच्छिन्नाधिकरणतानिरूपिताभावत्वाद्यवच्छिन्नाधेयत्वस्य, पर्वतनिरूपितस्य यत्र सत्वादिति वाच्यम्, आधेयत्वे अधिकरणत्वे वा पर्याप्त्यनुयोगितानवच्छेदकस्य तद्व्यक्तित्वावच्छिन्नत्वस्य वा विवक्षणात्तद्व्यावृत्ति।* Ibid, p-56
14. *न चैवमपि भिन्नविषयक शाब्दसामग्र्याः प्रत्यक्षसामग्र्यपेक्षया प्राबल्याद्योग्यताज्ञानविधया तद्घटकीभूतानां व्यधिकरणधर्मावच्छिन्न वह्न्यभावप्रमायां साध्यतावच्छेदकावच्छिन्न प्रकारत्वावच्छिन्न प्रायक्षनिष्ट प्रतिबध्यतानिरूपकत्वस्यैव सत्वादव्याप्तिः* p - 145

15. *अथैवं सति व्यधिकरणधर्मावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताक साध्याभावप्रमाया अपि समानविषयकप्रत्यक्षसामग्री विधया स्वसमान धर्मितावच्छेदकक साध्यवत्तानुमिति सामान्य प्रतिबन्धकत्वादव्याप्ति* Ibid, p-149

16. *अथ संयोग समवायादि नानासंसर्गक साध्यवत्ताज्ञानत्वव्यापिका कामिनीपिज्ञासा प्रतिबध्यतैव तदनिरूपकत्वञ्च साध्याभावप्रमासामान्यस्येत्यतिव्याप्तिः।* Ibid, p -140

17. *न चैवं सतीश्वरज्ञाने जन्यत्वाभावात्तद्विशेषरूप प्रतिबध्यतायां तत्साधारण साध्यवत्ताज्ञानव्यापकत्वा-सम्भवादसम्भव इति वाच्यम्, स्वरूपस्थाने स्वावच्छेदकविषयित्वस्य सम्बन्धत्वविवक्षणेन व्यापकत्वाक्षतेः, समानाकारकज्ञानेषु विषयिताभेदस्याप्रामाणिकतया ईश्वरज्ञानीय विषयिताया अपि प्रतिबध्यतावच्छेदकत्वात्* Ibid, p.p. - 162-163

18. Ibid, p-17

19. *अथ ह्रदः वह्नित्वावच्छिन्न प्रतियोगिताक वह्न्यभाववान् घटत्वेनवह्न्यभाववाच्येत्याकारक समूहा-लम्भन प्रमाया अपि सामान्यान्तर्गततया, तस्या स्वसमान धर्मितावच्छेदककसाध्यवत्ताज्ञान प्रतिबन्धकत्वादव्याप्तिः, न च समूहालम्भनभिन्नस्य प्रमायां विवक्षणान्नोक्त दोषः इति वाच्यम्।* Ibid, p.p. - 74-75

20. *तथाप्येकत्र द्वयमिति रीत्या तदुभयावगाहि ज्ञानाव्यावृत्तेः, न च प्रतिबध्यतायां भ्रमभिन्नवृत्तित्वं निवेश्यते, तथा च न कोऽपि दोष इति वाच्यम्, एवं सत्यतिव्याप्त्यापत्तेः अयोगोलकं धूमाभाववदित्यादि प्रमाया भ्रमं प्रत्येव प्रतिबन्धकत्वात्।* Ibid, p.p. 74-75

21. *न हि आधेयताया आधेयरूपत्वेऽप्याधारतापरमतिरिच्यते सैव हेतुतावच्छेदकसम्बन्धावच्छिन्नत्वेन विशिष्यते च तथा च नोक्तरीत्याऽव्याप्तिप्रसक्तिरिति वक्तुं युक्तम् विनिगमकाभावात्* Ibid, p-19

22. Ibid, p-156

23. *सामान्यपदस्य व्यापकत्वार्थ पर्यवसायितया लाघवानवकाशाच्च, एवं च साध्यवत्ता-नुमितित्वव्यापकत्वमेव विवक्षितुमुचितमिति* Ibid, p-147

24. Ibid, p-17

25. *एवमेतादृश दूषणोद्भावनार्थं धूमाधिकरणताभिन्ने साध्ये धूमाधिकरणत्व धूमाधिकरणत्व-निष्ठाधेयत्वैदन्यतरस्मिन् हेतावित्यादि स्थलविशेषप्रदर्शनं बहुरात्रिजागरणफलमिति वाढं ब्रूमः* Bhūmika by PRV

26. NRM, p-73

27. TC of Gangeśa Part II, p-54

28. NRM, p-168

29. Ibid, p-24

30. Ibid, p-24

31. *एवं कायव्यूहस्थले एकशरीरावच्छेदेन बाधबुद्धिसत्वे देशानवच्छिन्न विशेषणतया बाधाभावस्य तदात्मन्यसत्वाच्छरीरान्तरावच्छेदेनापि विशिष्टबुद्ध्यनुदयप्रसङ्गः* Ibid, p-108

32. Ibid, p.117

33. *एवं परकाय प्रवेशस्थले त्यज्यमानशरीरावच्छेदेन बाधबुद्धिसत्वे तदात्मन्यन्यशरीरावच्छेदेन विशिष्टबुद्ध्यापत्तिः।* Ibid, p.118

34. *अपि च भूतावेशस्थलेऽभिभाव्यस्य बाधनिश्चयसत्वे अभिभावक भूतादेस्तच्छरीरावच्छेदेन तद्वत्ताबुद्ध्यनुदय प्रसङ्गः।* Ibid, p-119

35. *काव्यव्यूहस्थले चैकशरीरावच्छेदेन बाधबुद्धिसत्वे तदात्मनि शरीरान्तरावच्छेदेनापि विशिष्टबुद्धिर्नोपेयते प्रमाणाभावात्, प्रामाणिकत्वेत्वनायत्या तत्तच्छरीरावच्छिन्नत्वमवच्छेदककोटौ निवेशनीयम्* Ibid, p-119

CHAPTER VI
OTHER WORKS OF ŚĀSTṚ ŚARMAN

Śāstṛ Śarman who has been proved to be a great scholar in Nyāya philosophy had contributed to some other branches of classical literature also. His works 'Gaṅgātaraṅgiṇī' and 'Cātakasandeśa' are two monumental and outstanding literary works belonging to the devotional and erotic lyrics respectively. Gaṅgātaraṅgiṇī seems to be more important and matured work than the other. It is the work of an author who possesses both poetic imagination and philosophic outlook.

I. Gaṅgātaraṅgiṇī

Gaṅgātaraṅgiṇī is an excellent Stotra kāvya consisting of twenty four chapters which are named as 'Tarangas' by the author. Each taranga contains twelve or thirteen verses in various metres. The author praises the 'Gaṅgā' with much devotion flowing from his heart. Hence "Bhaktibhāva" is depicted through out the poem. The poet is deeply devoted to 'River Gaṅgā' and she has been praised as a mother and Goddess having superior powers more than any other deity.

1. The text Gangātaraṅgiṇī

Gangātaraṅgiṇi with a commentary by the author himself was first published by Tarakkal Sankaranunni Warrier at Rāja Press Tripunithura in 1956. The most important asset of this publication is the few lines entitled "Abhiprāya (opinion)" written by the author's classmate Parīkṣit Rama Varma. He says that this work due to its beauty and the beautiful sense it conveys, will undoubtedly give great joy to the readers[1].

Prof. Acyuta Potuval, one of the students of the author and another well known Naiyāyika of that time has wriiten "the Avatārika" (introduction) in which a life history of Mantitta is described. His other works including Nacaratnamālikā are also mentioned there. Lastly Prof. Potuvāl prays that his God like preceptor night be pleased with this deed[2].

The preface (prastāvana) of the work consists four verses. In the first verse the author expresses his thankfulness to the king of Cochin - Dhārmikacakravarti with whom he was able to go to Kāśi tor the pilgrimage and had a holy bath in the water of Maṇikarṇika (the place of holy dip in Ganga). The second and third verses are to express the author's thankfullness to the great scholar in Nyāya as well as in Sāhitya ie Parīkṣit Rāma Varma, who is entitled "Darśanakalānidhi" and who

examined and corrected the work. In the last verse the poet expresses his thanks to his three disciples viz Śankaranunni Warrier, the publisher of work, C.K. Raman Nambiar and Acyuta Potuval who had helped to publish the work.

An outline of Devotional lyrics

As mentioned earlier Gangātaranginī is a devotional lyric, Bhakti being the main sentiment of the work, Poet's devotion to Goddess Gangā is expressed in different ways and in different words. Here it is not irrelevant to examine the conventional ideas about the Devotional lyrics in Sanskrit literature. The field of devotional lyrics is so vast that almost all poets have written one or more works for praising their own deities. Devotion is the source of such kāvyas. The description of the greatness and various deeds of the deities, prayer for worldly plesures prosperities and philosophical thoughts are the main themes of devotional lyrics.

Origin and Development of Devotional lyrics

The first verse in the Ṛgveda itself comes under this category which is well known as the praise of God Agni. Gāyatri Mantṛa is another example which praises the famous Āditya (Savitṛ as is called by Ṛgvedic Ṛṣis). Almost all the sūktās seen in the Rgveda are devotional in charecter

in an expressive or non expressive way.

The two epics Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata are also sources for these types of verses. Āditya stuti which is advised by sage Agastya to Rāma, Rāma stuti praised by Ahalyā, Viṣṇu stuti by Vibhīṣaṇa etc are very famous. Viṣṇusahasranāma a devotional piece which got universal appreciation is an advice of Bhīṣma to Yudhiṣṭhira in Mahābhārata. Arjuna's praise of Śrīkṛṣṇa in Bhagavadgīta is also noteworthy.

Bhāgavatapurāṇa is the most authentic work among the devotional treatises originated in the Puranic age. There we see many kinds of stutis expressing the intensity of devotee's feelings and prayers. The famous Lalitā sahasranāma is seen in Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa.

Coming to classical period Kālidāsa praises Brahma and Parameswara in his Kumārasambhava[3] and Viṣṇu in his Raghuvaṁśa[4]. Māgha gives a descriptive stuti of Kṛṣṇa by Bhīṣma[5]. Caṇḍīśataka, Sūryaśataka, Pancaśati, Devīśataka and numerous stotra kavyas of Śrīśankara are some other independent works of this series[6]. Later with the rise of Bhakti Movement we have the tradition of elaborate stotras of the descriptive as well as philosophical nature. The stotras of Śrīśankara occupy a unique place in this field. They are charmingly simple and

simply charming. The devotional material of every stotra are interconnected with the moral principles and spiritual values. The famous Gītāgovinda of Jayadeva and Śrīkṛṣṇa karṇāmṛta of Līlāśuka are to be specially mentioned here.

There are numerous devotional poems with the rivers as the subject. Among them the Gangālahari of Jagannātha Pandita, Gangaṣṭaka and Maṇikarṇikāṣṭaka of Śrīśankara are famous. The Sudhānandalahari of Kotungallur Godavarma Raja, the teacher of Śāstr Śarman, Gangāṣṭaka by the author's friend Parīkṣit Rāma Varma are other devotional poems which praises Gangā in simple and charming style.

The characteristics of Devotional Lyrics

As mentioned before Bhaktibhāva is depicted through out the poems of devotional lyrics. The conventional definition of stotra has ben come down to us thus

"नमस्कारस्तथाशीश्च सिद्धान्तोक्तिपराक्रमः
विभूतिः प्रार्थना चेति षड्विधं स्तोत्रलक्षणम्"[7]

Six are the characteristics that belong to every good variety of stotra. They are –

1. Salutation (Namaskārah)
2. Blessing (Āśis)
3. Statement of theories (Siddhāntoktiḥ)
4. Detailed description of powers (Parākramaḥ)
5. Prospirity (Vibhūtiḥ)
6. Prayer (Prārthanā)

All these characteristics of the Stotra kāvya mentioned above are seen in relation to the content of GT. A perusal of the verses would show that sometimes the poet salutes before the various forms of Ganga: sometimes many concepts and theories contained in the Purāṇa-s and different systems of philosophy are stated to show the greatness and sacredness of Gangā. There are detailed description on her magnanimity and powers. The external beauty of river Gangā also is the topic of description in many verses. At times the poet prays to Goddess Ganga and Lord Gangādhara for blessings, prospirity and freedom from the worldly sufferings for him and for the other devotees. The poet also requests to forgive all his sins and be a help in the last stage which is severe with numerous disease and problems.

2. Content of Gangātaraṅgiṇī

GT has no structural plot like all other stōtra kāvyas. The elaborate descriptions about the different characteristic features of Ganga form the theme of the work. The devine origin of Gangā from the heaven, her power to give freedom from all the sins and distribution of emancipation are discussed in the vedas, puranas etc. The author himself says in the last part of the kavya that many gifted poets had praised Gangā in sweet words, but the present poet had collected them and modelled as a stōtra kāvya[8]. So the difference lies in the order of putting words and sentences. Hence in Gangātaraṅgiṇī the references are effortlessly flowed from the heart of the poet to describe the greatness of Gangā.

Being an ardent devotee of Sri Paramaśwara, SS the author reached the abode of Lord Śiva viz Kāśi as a pilgrim. His deep rooted devotion burst out at the sight of Ganga on the bank of which Kāśi is situated. Then the poet felt the presence of mother Gangā who is adorned by his Lord Gangādhara. Hence the overflow of Gangādhara bhakti combined with Gangābhakti emerged as the tarangās in his tranquil mind and overflowed as the poem GT.

Salutation

The poet salutes Gangā in her numerous forms in the poem and in all the tarangas (chapters) the last verse is devoted to salute Gangādhara. It is described that Gangā obtained her devine form through her devine origin. She is related not only to Parameśwara but also to Brahma and Viṣṇu. The poet states that Gangā is originated from the devine 'Kamandalu' (niyamapātra) in which she was kept by Brahman, then it was submitted to the holy feet of Viṣṇu. By the penance of Bhagīratha she was adorned by 'Śambhu' on his devine head and then flowed to the Himālayas - the king of mountains. From there she reached the earth and to the nether world to give emancipation for the forefathers of Bhagīratha[9]. Hence SS salutes Ganga in her numerous forms viz. Mother, Goddess, Bhagīrathī, Parabrahmamahiṣi, Pāpanāśini and so on.

The kāvya begins with a request to mother Ganga to forgive his adventure. The adventure is that the poet tries to decribe her greatness, which is not fully known even by the Gods, hence she is definitely indescribable for an ordinary man, but the poet addresses Gangā as 'mother' because mothers are always merciful to their children and willing to forgive their sins. Hence the poet admits that he is trying to describe her not by his excellence but by the deep devotion to the mother. In

many instances the poet salutes Gangā with the feelings of a devoted child. The picture of a mother who puts the tired child in her lap to sleep by giving milk and with sweet and mild music is seen in many verses[10]. In another verse also the capacity of the mother Gangā to protect and console her child by giving the milk (devine water) is described[11].

The form of a Goddess is given in many other verses. Sometimes the poet salutes Gangā as a Goddess who is worshiped by all other holy rivers. In a verse the poet salutes Ganga in her different forms like the 'abode of righteousness' and 'jāhnavi' who ornates the hair of Śambhu and who reaches to the ocean[12]. The poet salutes Gangā whose lotus feet, Lord Parameśwara the husband of Gaurī and who bears the moon in his head, like to put on his head[13]. Sometimes the poet bows before Gangā as the essence of merits attained by Saptarṣi, capable to destroy all the severe diseases, merciful to the devotees and who is honoured as the most holy among other rivers[14].

Statement of theories

The sacredness and purity of Gangā is shown by the poet with the help of many references from Purāṇas. The sacred origin from heaven and the power to destroy the sins of the devotees, who shines as an

ornament on the head of Śiva and who flows to various direction to give blessings for the people are referred to in numerous verses[15]. The theories from different systems of philosophy are also utilised to establish the greatness of Gangā. The poet states that Parabrahma which is unitary and devoid of qualities is beyond our description, but when it is covered by the Māya, the Parabrahma becomes the source of the differences in the universe. So the Kartṛtva of the universe is attributed to that Caitanya[16]. The poet considers the Parabrahma as Śrī Parameśwara and the power which covers it as the mother Gangā so occassionally he addresses Gangā as 'Parabrahmamahiṣi'[17]. In another verse the poet states that she is the source for the diversity in this world which consists numerous objects like villages, towns, rivers, oceans, people, animals etc with different characteristics. He adds that just as a cloth which rests in the yarns is not different from the yarns feels as if different similarly the world which is not different from the Parabhrahma feels as if it is different. So this world is only a Pratibhāsa[18]. The same idea is given in many other verses in the poem. The poet establishes the significance of 'Saguṇopāsanā' through the poem and he remarks in a verse that the devotion and worship of Gangā (a saguṇopāsanā) is the way to experience the indescribable and formless 'Parabrahma'. The inference, the earth sprout etc are created by a creator as they are

products like a pot - (Kṣityankurādikam kātṛjanyam kāryatvād ghatavad) is well known among the Naiyāyikas and they use this inference to establish 'the God' as the creator of the universe. The poet used this Nyāya concept in a verse and accepted Lord Parameśwara as the creator of the universe.

Elaborate description of powers

The prime part of GT is devoted to describe the supreme powers of gangā. The devine origin, the power to give freedom from the severe sins, give emancipation for those who are related to Ganga and the capacity to destroy the worldly toils like diseases etc are accepted by the poet as subjects to the descriptions. The generosity of the mother is described in such a way that the eternal freedom from the worldly bondage can be attained only through hard and long penance, sacrifices, meditation etc so it is not accessible to a common man whose body is weak and life is very short. But this final end of human life viz. emancipation is given by Goddess Gangā to those who are having a mere bath in her holy water[19]. In another verse Gangā is compared to a river Vijarā or Virajā situated near Brahmaloka for she sweeps away every sin of mankind. Even though there are hundreds of rivers filled with water and flows continuously, only Gangā can wash away the toils (duritāni) of man

Brahmahatyā, Gurudāragamana, Svarṇāpaharaṇa and Madyapāna are considered as severe sins which cannot be removed or repended easily. But Goddess Gangā is always enthusiastic to take away even such sins from the people who is devoted to her[20]. The poet calls Gangā as 'Daśahara'[21] - one who takes aways the ten major sins. He states that every man who take bath in her water, put her waterdrops in the forehead, remember her with reverence, recite, her name with devotion are taken away to heaven. Everthough they are sinness, they are considered as the most pious people. If anyone touches or drinks the Gangājala at the time of his death, will be taken to the heaven by the heavenly people. Even Parameśwara is not capable to give emancipation without the help of Gangā[22]. So Lord Śiva adorns her in his head with high reverence.

The power of Gangā to give relief from the worldly disease and sufferings are described in a number of verses. The poet says that the poeple who are defeated by various disease and foresaken by doctors as well relatives depend only mother Gangā[23] then they attain relief from their diseases and finally taken to the abode of Brahman. Gangā flowed from heaven to earth to save people who have fallen down in the deep well of worldly problems Goddess Gangā takes them to the abode of Viṣṇu. Even the people worried by the worldly problems and stay far

away from Gangā are called by her making noise with the hands of high waves for a bath, then she gives relief from the worries[24]. Hence the magnanimity is described in a way that even the people standing without knowing about Gangā are also attracted by her and attain supreme happiness. The poet suggests medicine for severe diseases like leprosy from Gangā. The poet is of opinion that such diseases can be cured by drinking the sweet water from Gangā which contains the essence of medicinal plants, or by smearing the mud from it and chanting the name of Goddess Jāhnavī[25]. The poet says that he had attained the devine medicine viz the sight of Goddess Gangā in Kāśi which is the city honoured by the great doctor Parameśwara who is capable to destroy all the sins. The poet wonders why people follow other Gods when they could reach the eternity by merely a holy bath in the water of Gangā.

At times the devine beauty of Gangā is potrayed, the eighth taranga of the poem is full of such descriptions. The devine form of Gangā is figuratively expressed in many verses. In one verse the poet describes that, the beauty of the eyes of Lord Śiva, which can be identified with the victory flag of Kāmadeva and which plays in the milky ocean of her beauty reaches supreme bliss after getting acquiantance with Gangā's eye sight similar to actual indranīla[26]. The devine and attractive form of

Gangā is potrayed in such a way that it is in the stage of youth like the blooming Malli flower of Kāmadeva, face similar to the lord of stars which is even attractive for Lord Śiva, with high breasts and hairs which reaches upto the feet[27]. The external beauty is also discussed in such a way that, some parts of Gangā there is jumping fishes and the like, in some other places the hard flow of waters yet in another place the up and down of the waves. There is stillness as well as caos; like that there is purity (vimalata) as well as muddy (kāluṣya)[28]. The high waves are described as the dance of Gangā on the head of Lord Śiva with sweet music of the high waves produced by the high breeze. This music purify the ears and obstructs all other sounds which polute the ears[29]. The flowing of Gangā from the 'jaṭa' of Paramaśiva is pictured as the raw of lotus flowers, the reddish sight of Pārvatī due to anger to the cowife is prohibiting by the lotus like hands of Gangā[30]. The hands are putting continously so it feels as if the raw of lotus flowers.

Blessings and Prospirity

SS occassionally requests in the kāvya for the blessings from Gangā and Gangādhara to get the eternal easiness and happiness (Sustiti sthemasaukhyam)[31]. He never requests worldly pleasures like wealth etc but always prays for the blessings for devine happiness. For the well

beings for the people at times the poet wishes blessings of Gangā. The poet says that the people who are tired with mental and bodily sufferings of the world could not be consoled until they reach the bank of river Gangā. Sometimes the poet requests her to show mercy to those who are not cared to perform the ritual practices instructed by the vedas and those who circles like the animals in the worldly passions who are unable to cross the worldly ocean without the mercy of Goddess Gangā[32]. The poet requests Gangā to cool the hot body and mind of the people with the cool and holy water and console them by the soothing touch of her hands.

Prayers

There exists a number of verses in the GT which can be considered as prayers. The poet is very happy as he reached in the banks of Gangā where both Viṣṇu and Śiva live giving moksa to people and arguing each other that a man who passes away by taking bath in the Gangā will get the form of either Viṣṇu or Śiva. Hence the poet requests permission to take bath in the Maṇikarṇika (the place of holy dip)[33]. He also prays the Goddess to change him a firm devotee of her[34]. Occasionally the poet seems to be very much anxious about his last days. He remembers this stage of life and prays to give the devine medicine in that final stage which is severe with the breathing troubles

owing to the defects of 'kapha' and which cannot be cured by ordinary medicines or doctors. But the poet says that he is not feared because he reached near the Goddess to get the devine medicine[35]. His prayer to the Goddess is to be with him and give the touch of her lotus feet which itself is the devine medicine for all severe diseases. In another verse the poet addresses Gangā as 'Bhiṣaktamakutumbinī'[36] (wife of the great doctor) and prays not to abandon him in the last days. The poet explains his physical stage as old, and weak due to many kinds of severe diseases and request Gangā to consider him as a servant not as a sinner. In another occasion he prays to Gangā that when his life ends, the name and water of 'Gangā' which touch his tongue may be the destroyer of all kinds of sins and which may give the merits of all the holy waters.

In one verse of the last taranga the poet addresses Gangā as 'mother' and says that he is a sinner as he is indulged in the ocean of worldly passions and prays to free him from all such sins by her mercy[37]. At the concluding portion of the kāvya the poet overflowed his heart with devotion prays that his only wish is to get the blessings from Gangā to concentrate his mind on the lotus feet of the mother, two eyes on the body of Lord Śiva two hands to give offerings to that Lord, words to his prayers, ears for hearing good stories about him and two legs to

circumbulate (pradakṣiṇa) him[38]. Thus the various aspects of Gangā felt in the heart of poet flows like the tarangas of Gangā and they are elaborately described by the poet in the twenty four chapters of GT.

3. Literary Estimate

From a perusal of the whole stotra kāvya it is clear that Śāstṛ Śarman has a unique position among the devotional poets. As a poet he has a spendid imagination and creative talent. Hence verses came fluently from his deeply devoted heart. His knowledge in various śāstra-s, systems of philosophy, purāṇa-s and epics is wonderful that he includes stories and theories one by one in the stotra kāvya.

Figures of speech

The poet uses almost all the famous figures of speech in a beautiful manner. A few examples may be quoted here.

भास्वत्तारा सुरतटिनि यं तावकापाङ्गलीला-
रात्रिर्गच्छत्यभिमुखमहो मर्त्यमप्यस्वरूपम् ।।
हासज्योत्स्नापटलविमला तं स्वयं रूढरागा
वामाक्षीव द्रुतमभिसरत्येव कैवल्यलक्ष्मीः ।। 39

In this verse the poet describes that Kaivalyalakṣmi will quickly come and please to one who is devoted to Goddess Gangā like a beautiful damsel who has deep love for her lover. Hence upama the first figure of speech is seen with its spendour.

The first verse of sixth taranga is another example of beautiful simily. Here Gangā who has originated from the feet of Visṇu and reach the earth with thousand faces is compared to the purest words of Srisankara which had been based on "Advaya siddhānta" and "Upaniṣads". In the verse all the adjectives have double meaning which relate to both Gangā and the words of Srisankara. Almost all verses have this quality and in this way every simily is beautiful by śleṣa[40]. We can see beautiful similies in numerous other verses also.

Like most of the stotra kāvyas GT presents beautiful metaphorical usages and numerous Rūpakālamkāras through out the verses. The nineth taranga is a fine example. In the twelveth taranga we see a beautiful Malārūpaka thus

बलिमथनपदाम्भोजातराजन्मृणाली।
स्मरमथनकपर्दोदारमन्दारमाला॥
श्रितजनसुरवल्ली मोक्षसाम्राज्यलक्ष्म्या।
जयसि जयपताका शैलजे काशिकायाम्॥

Vyatirekālamkāras are also used in the poem in a beautiful manner. For example:-

त्रिदशदनुजपाली मन्दरोन्मथ्यमान-।
प्रपलितकलशाब्धिस्फीतकल्लोलतुङ्गाः॥
हरशिरसि लसन्त्यो देवी पीयूषसारा।
विषहरणसमर्था वीचयस्ते जयन्ति॥ 41

Here the waves of Gangā are said to be genuine that they can destroy even the poison.

The figures of speech viz Samāsokti and Atiśayokti are so many with inner meanigs.

श्रान्तं नितान्तं भवकाननान्तश्चिरं विहारेण निरन्तरेण।
दत्वा पयः स्वं मुदुवीचिगीतैः प्रस्वापयैतं जननि त्वदङ्के॥

Here the idea of a mother is suggested, so it is samāsokti.

A beautiful hetutprekṣa is seen in the following verse.

व्रीलानम्रं मृदुकिसलयं तन्वती काननान्तः।
सान्ध्यं वन्ध्यं दिनकररुचां सञ्चयं संविधात्री॥
लब्धुं स्वीयं गुणमभिलषन् कुर्वती चातपस्य-।
द्रक्ताम्भोजं पयसि हृदये भासतां त्वत्पदश्रीः॥42

Here the shyness of the tender leaves, fruitlessness of the evening twilight and the standing of lotuses in the water are attributed as such due to the wish to get the beauty of the feet of Gangā.

The following verse -

श्रृत्यन्तस्थं नयनमिव सद्वृत्तशुद्धद्विजेन्द्रै- ।
र्जुष्टं दन्तच्छदमिव समै पादपङ्केरुहं ते ॥
मुक्तासेव्यं स्तनयुगमिव स्वाश्रिताभीष्टदान- ।
प्रोद्यत्ख्याति क्षितिधरसुते सर्वदा संश्रयेऽहम् ॥[43]

The poet tells that he depends upon her lotus feet like her eyes, teeth and breast. Here the figure of speech is upamā, but the beauty of the poem rests not upon this simily but the two words having double meanings viz सद्वृत्तशुद्धद्विजेन्द्रैः and मुक्तासेव्यं । Here the figure of speech is śleṣa and hence the verse is an example for Sankara. Rūpaka is also seen in the word "pādapankeruha".

Thus there is abundance of Arthālankāra through out the stotra kāvya. The use is natural and not at all artificial that the imaginative power of the poet is very clear from the verses of the poem. Even Śabdālankāra like Anuprāsa and Yamaka are used in a natural way[44] and the reader is delighted to go through the verse one by one in GT.

The use of metres

Almost all the samavṛttas are seen used by the author of GT, Mātrāvṛttas viz Ārya is used in the eighteenth and nineteenth tarangas and Gīti is seen only in two verses (fifth and sixth) of the twenty second taranga. It seems that the poets most favourite metre is Mālini. This beautiful metre is used for the last verse of all the twenty four tarangas, besides the 11th and 12th tarangas. The tarangas from first to twenty first the conventional law of metre is followed where one metre is used in a whole sarga, the metre of the last verse only is chaged. But in the last three tarangas ie 22nd, 23rd, 24th various metres are used in various verses besides Mālini and Mātravṛttas.

The metres used by the poet are the following.

4. **Śārdūlavikrīḍita** - The verse of 1st and 2nd tarangas, in the 3rd and 10th verses of 22nd taranga, in the 9th verse of 23rd taranga and in the 1st, 9th, 14th verses of 24th taranga this metre is used.

5. **Sragdhara** - This metre is used in the verses of 3rd and 4th taranga, in 2nd verse of 22nd taranga, in 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 10th, 11th and 12th verse of 23rd taranga and in 2nd, 11th and

12th verses of 24th taranga.

6. **Śikhariṇī** is used in the verses of 5th and 6th taranga whole, in the 8th verse of 22nd taranga and in the 3rd and 4th verses in 23rd taranga.

7. **Mandākrāntā** is used in the verses of 7th and 8th taranga and in the 5th verse of 24th taranga.

8. **Prithvī** is used in the verses 9th and 10th tarangas, in the first verse of 22nd taranga, 1st verse of 23rd taranga and in the 15th verse of 24th taranga.

9. **Vasantatilaka** is used in three tarangas viz 13th, 14th and 15th, and in the verse 7th of 22nd taranga, 2nd of 23rd taranga and 3rd, 7th, and 13th of 24th tarangas.

10. **Upajāti** is used in the verse of 16th and 17th tarangas.

11. **Upendravajrā** is used in the 4th verse of 24th taranga only.

12. **Drutavilambita** is used in the verses of 20th and 21st tarangas.

Therefore it can be concluded that the selection of metres in the composition of this stotra kavya is most proper and beautiful. Its

harmonious unity indicates devotion and delight to readers.

Devotional aspects

Gangātaraṅgiṇī is a devotional lyric having much philosophic value due to its treatment of theories and ideas related to various Darśanas and Śāstras. Being a staunch devotee of Lord Viśwanātha or Śiva, the poet praises Gangā along with that of Viśwanātha. The poet does not avoid any chance to praise him. He uses the method of praising Viśwanātha at the end of every taranga.

In the opening verse of first Taranga where the poet addresses Mother Gangā, the poet mentions Śiva along with Viṣṇu. In the last verse Viśwanātha is praised as seated in Gāyatrī. In the second taranga viśwanātha is described as situated in the centre of Ādityamaṇḍala with lotus like eyes and gold like body. He is circled by the Bālakhilyas. In the last verse of third taranga the poet bows Śiva in the form of Śambhu. In the last verse of fourth taranga, Śiva is mentioned as related to a puranic story that once sage Vyāsa, who raising his hand insulted Parameśwara, was cursed by Nandi, the main servant of Śiva and became motionless.

Next taranga describes the physical embellishments of Viśwanātha

who destroyed the pride of Brahma, Viṣṇu, Indra etc by his own partial Avatāras like Bhairava, Śarabha, Vīrabhadra etc. At the last verse of sixth taranga, the poet prays that the Lord of Kāśi, who is the light of all that bright and the witness of all the universe and who is the purest light might remove the darkness from his mind. The same thing is repeated in the seventh taranga also.

In the nineth taranga, the poet mentions the ability of Viśwānatha in creating everything by the 'Katākṣa' of his beloved 'Devī', 'Neelakantha' is the more beautiful than 'Kāmadeva'. He has three eyes and is embellished by serpant and 'Jaṭā'. His body is smeared with ashes. In his left part he is united with Sri Pārvatī. The poet bows to the God to Vāraṇasi and the six angas[45]. In one of the concluding verse Viśwanātha is described as a lover of heavenly river. In another the destruction of Tripuras by Parameśwara is referred to.

In more than one verse Kāśinātha whose abode is Śmāśāna and who has taken kapāla in his hand is described. He is Digambara and is followed by dogs. All the Gods stand near him bending down. Brahma and Viṣṇu both search his route but did not find out because he is the Lord who has neither production (ādi) nor destruction (antha). The purāna episode that Viṣṇu has got various boons from Śiva and Mahābhārata

story that Arjuna won the battle of Kurukṣetra with the help of Parameśwara is described. In the last verse of 22nd Taranga the story of a cock is mentioned. He was reborn as a śabara by eating the 'prasāda' of Śiva, supplied his own eyes to the Lord of Kāsi and attained mokṣa. In the last two tarangas Viśwanātha's beautiful form and his curse to Baṇāsura are described.

Hence poet expresses his devotion to Viswanātha in twenty four tarangas. In the whole work at times SS praises him being the abode of Gangā and lastly without satisfying by these, as an appendix to Gangātaranginī, the poet has written a Viśwanāthaṣṭaka consisting of eight beautiful verses in praise of Kāśiviśwanātha[46].

The poet regards his life is fruitful because he was able to visit Kāśi and had bath in the holy river. SS says that the time he spent in Kāśi are considered to be the most auspicious days, as he got the opportunity to sit on the bank of the river by discussing the greatness of Kāśi. He got opportunity to experience directly the cold breeze arised from the holy river which is having the attractive fragrance of the lotus flowers. The poet is anxious whether he could have another visit and holy bath in the river Gangā. He is longing to hear the auspicious sound arising from the couch in the temple, chant the names of Srī Parameśwara,

worship him with Bilvapatras and to sing his praises. The holy water which is capable to destroy all sins is tastier than the nector for him. Hence the path of devotion which is extold by the great sages as superior to jñāna and karma is clearly depicted by the poet in this stōtrakāvya. The greatness of Gangādhara, Gangā and Kāśi which the author had heard from the ancient literature was directly seen and experienced by him through his pilgrimage. The feelings of the poet got maturity and the flow of that devotion can be experienced in Gangātaranginī by the readers also. The poet wishes that this 'Gangātaranginī' will be such a poem which is capable to instigate and enrich the devotion to the readers also.

II. Cātakasandeśa

The writers of Kerala Sanskrit literature like Vadakkamkur Rajarajavarma or Ullur S. Parameswara Ayer had not included the text 'Cātakasandeśa' among the works of Sāstṛśarman. But this work with a Sanskrit commentary and critical study was published by Dr. P.C.-Muralimadhavan from Trissur in 1992 as the work of Sāstṛ śarman. Dr. Muralimādhavan remarks that till1978 there was no information about the existence of a kavya like Cātakasandeśa, two manuscripts of the work were found out by Prof. Vāsudevan Elayath, a disciple of Śāstṛśarman from the collections of manuscripts preserved at the 'Māntitta illom'.

Dr. Muralimādhavan critically examined it and established that it is a work of the present author[47].

As the title itself indicates Cātakasandeśa is a message poem following the general pattern of the well known 'Meghadūta' of Kālidāsa. Kerala's contribution to Sanskrit consists of many works of this type and Cātakasandeśa is a typical example in this regard.

Theme of the work

The subject matter of the work is a message sent from Venkitangu by a young Brahmin to his beloved residing at Harippat Kovilakam. Muralimadhavan identifies the hero of the poem as the author Śāstṛśarman and heroine as Ambālikā Tampuratty - the niece of Kerala Varma Valiyakoyi Tampuran. The main sentiment is as usual vipralambasrngāra. The hero is seperated from his beloved for one year since he has to perform the 'Dīkṣā' for his brother[48]. At the beginning of a rainy season, as in the case of Meghadūta the hero who was suffering from the pangs of seperation from his beloved, sees a Cātaka bird. He then addresses the bird and requests the bird to take a message to his beloved. The poem begins with the word "kaścit" as in the case of Meghadūta, like that the first part consists the description of the route

from Venkitangu to the southern part of Kerala upto Harippat.

The second part contains the description of the home and surroundings of the heroine along with the love message to heroine. The messenger viz. Cātaka is believed to have the power of speaking the devine language due to the blessings of Indra.

Characteristics of the work

There is not much originality in the Cātakasandeśa as it has been influenced much by the Meghadūta, but it gives numerous informations on the literary, social, economic, geographical and political conditions of Kerala of his time. The poet requests the Cātaka to start his journey after saluting the deity of Śankaranārayana temple. The poet mentions a veda pāṭhaśāla functioning in the temple where the Nampootiri Brahmins study vedas by noding their heads, and with the signs of their hands when they understand the meaning of the hymns[49]. The east of that temple is pictured with vast lake which is used for paddy cultivation. When the bird flies to further east, the poet writes, the bird will reach the Vadakkumnātha kṣetṛa, which is one of the famous temples of Kerala[50]. It lies on the top of the hill at Trissur where five 'Deities' are installed viz. Śiva, Pārvatī, Śankaranārayana, Gaṇapati and Srīrāma. The picture of

the Trissur town is available from the descriptions given by the poet. The town is described, with fashionable and educated people, street full of big buildings, shopes, and well dressed children going to school. The Brahmaswam Maṭhom at Trissur which functions as a vedic pāṭhaśāla is also included in the descriptions. On the way the bird reaches the Trikkaṇāmatilakom, which was mentioned as a prosperous city in the poem 'Śukasandeśa' of Lekṣmīdāsa is described by Śāstṛśarman as a place which has changed almost to a desert[43].

When the bird reaches Kotungallur, the famous Devikṣetṛa known as 'Kurumba kāvu' is mentioned[51]. Then the Kotungallur kovilakam which was the 'Gurukula' of the poet is the topic of description. The famous scholars like Prince Ramavarma IVth, his elder brother Kunjunni Raja, who was a well known teacher, Koccunni Raja, well known poet, scholar and physician were also mentioned[52]. Another scholar of that family - Godavarma Bhattan Tampuran, the famous Nyāya teacher of Śāstṛ Śarman is reverently remembered as the master in Vyākaraṇa, Nyāya, Vedānta and Dharmaśāstṛa. The reference of Kunhikuttan Tampuran, who translated the Mahabhārata into Malayalam language in the same metre of the original is noteworthy[53]. Another scholar he remembers is Koccunni Rāja well known scholar in astrology.

When the Cātaka reaches at Etappilly, the newly started train service to Ernakulam is depicted as an amazing sight for the bird[54]. He says that Cochin town was a gift given by the King of Etappilly to his wife belonging to Cochin royal family[55]. Through the description available about the Cochin city it feels that this place is very much familiar for the poet. All the famous places and institutions are mentioned by the poet viz. the tall white buildings, the famous Śiva temple, two Christian churches, the jail, market, the Visnu temple of Sāraswata Brahmins, the crowded road, the hospital, the spacious college where English is taught, the high court, revenew office and so on[56]. It is also said that traders like Gujarati, Portugese, Dutch and English obtained godown and trade centres through battles or trade in that town. He points out that the vast coconut grows of the west of the road were cut down by the minister Rajagopalacari for making beautiful gardens upto the sea coast[57].

Then come the descriptions related to Tripunithura, the capital city of Cochin royal family. The famous Viṣṇu temple where the deity is in sitting posture on Ananta, the beautiful princesses coming to the temple and the princes who are learned persons in English and Sanskrit are included as the topics for description while giving the instructions about the route to the Cātaka. The poet also mentions the greatness of the

kings of the Cochin royal family, as there slokan is 'Mānam kuladhanam hi naḥ'[58]. Further south to the city situates the Hill Palace, known as 'Kanakakkunnu koṭṭāram' the residential quarters of the Cochin royal family. While giving the description of this palace the poet reminds the bird not to go near the king Rājarṣi Rāma Varmaṇ because that king is 'Ratnahāri'[59] (who takes away all the valuable objects). The poet may have remembered the incident that he who was a precious jewel of scholars has been taken away by the King Rājarṣi and appointed as the Nyāya teacher in the Mahāpaṭhaśāla, Tripunithura, established by Rājarṣi Rāma Varman.

On the way to south, the Śiva temple at Vaikom is shown as a place where feast is served daily for the Brahmins. When the bird reaches Ambalapuzha the famous Visṇu temple is mentioned with its speciality viz. the 'Pālpāyasa'. The historical event that formerly the king of Ambalapuzha was a feudatory of the king of Cochin. King Marthandha varma of Travancore conquered king Devanārayana of Ambalapuzha in the last century is mentioned[60]. It is also pointed out by the poet that the kings of Ambalapuzha were patrons of great scholars, artists and poets like Melputhur Nārayaṇa Bhaṭṭa - a famous poet, and Kunjan Nambiar, famous "oṭṭamtuḷḷal" artist.

The second part of the poem gives the description of the Harippat town, the surroundings and the home of the heroine. The etymology for the place name "Harippat" is given like this - once Nārada in the company of Hari (Viṣṇu) praised (Pāttu) the Lord Subrahmaṇya of the temple[61]. The town Harippat is described as a beautiful place. The author says that the Anantapuram Royal family originally belonged to Parappankot, but came to Harippat at the time of the invasion of Tippu. Many scholars belonging to the family are mentioned by the poet. He says that the elder member of the family Rajaraja is a physician and poet (Mūtta Koyil Tampuran), his younger brother Kerala varma is mentioned as residing at Tiruvanandapuram. His brother Ramavarma, and Rajarajavarma well known as Kerala Pāṇini are also noted by the poet[62].

The power of description in giving the pictures of the famous places, temples as well as the scholars of that time establishes that the poet was a person who had travelled through out the country and is aware of the historical incidents. Hence the historical awareness, the devotion to deities and respect to the scholars are the notable charecteristic features of the poet. The elaborate use of figures of speech, both in sound and sense, the suggestive meaning seen here and there; the propriety in selecting words and phrases in the verses makes this

Sandeśakāvya a beautiful work of SS[63].

III. Commentaries written by Śāstṛśarman

1. Nutanāloka on Nacaratnamalikā

The Nūtanāloka is an exhaustive commentary written by Śāstṛśarman on his Nyāya work NRM. The purpose to write the commentary is that the inner meaning contained in the original cannot be understood to a common reader without explanations. Hence the author wrote the commentary with vast explanations, out of compassion towards his disciples. The commentary not only elucidates and develops the idea included in the text but also reviewed critically various theories contained in other systems of philosophy. Therefore it is a storehouse of valuable information on philosophy and logic.

Characteristic features of Nūtanāloka

Being a reputed Nyāya scholar our author was equally well versed in sruti, smṛti upaniṣads itihāsa and purāṇas. He exhibits his wholesome scholarship in the commentary to make clear the abruse ideas contained in the original. Hence it gives a new vision (nutanāloka) to the original and helps to view the ideas through further angles.

But in certain occasions the discussions extends as if the author is deliberately creating chances to add more details. So certain incidental and indirect topics were inserted in the commentary. At times the explanation of a topic spreads from one point to another points by adopting ideas from other Śāstras and even from common beliefs. This method of discussions are generally followed in the "Vākyārtha sadas" where the participants will ask questions or point out objections from every sides of the topic under discussion. Hence the proposer of the Vākyārthavicāra had to solve all that objections, and topics which are having only indirect relationship to the main subject. Śāstṛśarman, a regular participant of the 'Śāstra sadas' and an authority in Navya Nyāya adopted that method in composing the NUA. The language he adopted in NUA is that which is seen in the higher works of Navya Nyāya.

Two topics of discussion from NUA is shown below as examples in this regard. First one is from the second Āvali of NRM where there is a discussion about the concept of 'Pratibandhakatva' existing in the knowledge of the absence of existence to the knowledge of its existence. (तद्वत्ता बुद्धौ तदभाववत्ता निश्चयस्य प्रतिबन्धकत्वम्)। Then there arises an objection to the former idea that the knowledge which is an avyāpyavṛtti (incomplete occurrence) guṇa cannot be obstructed by a contradictory

knowledge. Hence it is suggested that the contradictory knowledge which is not limited by space (deśānavacchinna) is considered to be the pratibandhaka. Then the author suspects defects in the concept of pratibandhakatva with the help of a conventional belief among Indians viz. 'Kāyavyūha'[64]. The NUA discusses this belief and the allied issues by adopting ideas from upaniṣads, purāṇas and from the Bhagavadgīta. Further the discussion spreads to another topics whether karmanāśakatva can be accepted to Tattvajñāna and to the types of karma.

The concept called 'kāyavyūha' is considered under the belief that the souls of sages etc accepts many bodies at a time through their yogic power and travels the whole earth. Some may consume different objects and some do hard penance and thereby the karmaphala comes to an end after experiencing the results. Hence the 'karmanāśa' which can be attained only by 'tattvajñāna' or by the power of penance can be attained as early as possible by accepting the 'kāyavyūha'[65]. The Vāmadeva and Saubhari are such sages mentioned in Bhāgavata.

Another objection is arised with the help of the theory that, the destruction of Karmaphala can be acquired only through right knowledge and Mokṣa is the effect gradually produced from the true knowledge. Hence the final aim viz. liberation cannot be attained through the

'kayavyuha'. The reply to the objection is that the 'Sancita karma' existing in the soul can be destroyed by the 'tattvajñāna' but the 'prārabdha karma' - the merits or demerits which are evolved by actions should be enjoyed or suffered in the life. The theory is that "effects of actions, auspicious or inauspicious, if not experienced cannot be destroyed even after many many years," so kāyavyūha is accepted to experience the 'karmaphala' and thereby get freedom from the 'prārabdha karma'[66].

Then another issue arises is that if the right knowledge is the cause for the annihilation of 'Adṛṣṭa' then it cannot considered to be the cause for the production of virtue (puṇya) which is in the nature of the blessing of God (Bhagavat prasāda) because one thing cannot be regarded as the destroyer and producer which are of contradictory characteristics. The author replies that the tattvajñāna is not considered to be as devotion - devotion is the operative force (vyāpāra) which produces the blessings of God. The author adds that there is no contradiction for the production of 'Puṇya' from 'tattvajñāna' because the generic attribute - i.e 'avacchedaka' which is destroyed by 'tattvajñāna' and the special kind of virtue (puṇya viśeṣa) which is produced from 'tattvajñāna' are of different forms[67].

The discussion goes on to another topics; i.e the tattvajñāna

cannot be considered to the cause of karmanāśa because, the 'adrṣta' which is produced from the actions will be ceased only by consuming it. Otherwise the sentences like "Nābhuktam kṣīyate karma.." etc. cannot be explained. If the annihilation of karmaphala is not attributed to tattvajñāna the 'jñāni' who had attained right knowledge cannot attain eternal freedom from sufferings and his right knowledge becomes of no use. Then the Upaniṣad vākya, he who has known the nature of soul, cross the greif by getting freedom from sufferings will have no relevance[68].

As a remedy to the problems arised above, it is said that the freedom from Prārabdha karma can be attained only by experiencing its results. If tattvajñāna occurs in the soul the wrong knowledge can be destroyed gradually from that soul and thereby freed from the vāsanā which is the effect arised only through wrong knowledge. By the annihilation of the vāsana there will not occur further 'adrṣta' because the wrong knowledge is the cause which persuades men to do prohibited actions. If there are no actions there will not arise fresh 'adrṣta' and gradually that soul will be freed from the sufferings, because 'adrṣta' is the cause which is capable to give happiness and sufferings. The complete freedom from sufferings is called liberation. If the actions are not destroyed by tattvajñāna there will be sufferings and the devices like,

'sravaṇa' 'manana' etc will be continued to attain tattvajñāna. As a support to this view the words of Śrīkṛṣṇa in Bhagavadgīta i.e "jñānāgniḥ sarvakarmaṇi bhasmasāt kurutearjuna" is quoted. Just as fire consumes fuel, the tattvajñāna destroys the karma. Then another problem arises is that there is a conventional belief among the Indians that even a sinful person who dies in the holy city of Viśwanatha is freed from his sins and attain salvation. If salvation can be attained only by experiencing the results of karma, a man died in the holy city cannot attain Mokṣa. A reply to this issue is given that there is no other way to show relevance for such kinds of belief. So a body to consume the fruits of actions should be assumed[69].

If 'tattvajñāna' is considered to be the direct cause which destroys the 'Adṛṣṭa' then two kinds of cause and effect relationship should be accepted viz. in certain instances tattvajnana and in other instances the 'bhoga'. Hence two separate cause and effect relationship is accepted to avoid the defect called ' vyabhicāra'. If the adṛṣṭa nāśa is occurred by tattvajñāna - it is the cause. If that is by 'bhoga' the cause for karmanāśa is attributed to bhoga.

Then the author gives a description about the three types of karma viz. 'Prārabdha', 'Sancita' and 'Āgāmi'. The body which we attained

is by the power of 'prārabdha karma'. The karma which exists different from that is 'sancita'. The karma which is to occur through future life is 'āgāmi'. Among these three types of karmas the freedom from 'prārabdha karma' can be obtained only by enjoying or suffering its results. The sentences like "Nābhuktam" etc indicate such karma. The 'sancita' and 'āgāmi' karma-'s will be annihilated only by true knowledge. The sentences like "kṣīyante cāsya karmāṇi" refers to such 'karmās'. It is also suggested by SS that one who had known the 'Brahma' will not be touched by another merit or demerit. They are totally freed from the sins even without a touch of it, and their sancita karmas are also annihilated even the body may remain with the soul to experience the 'prarabdha karma'. The soul remains without any touch of sins like the lotus leaf which floats on the water[70].

Another topic discussed in the third 'āvalī' of the text is pointed out here as another example to show the characteristics of NUA. There is a discussion of the viśeṣadarśana that whether it can be considered to be a cause of perception after doubt. In the NRM it is said that if a viparīta niścaya in the form of "it is a pillar, not a man is arised after doubt, then a definite knowledge that 'it is a man' will not occur until there arises the vyāpyavattajñāna that this object possesses hands action etc - 'the vyāpyavatta niścaya'[71].

In NUA it is said that it is the view of 'Mirsra'. The author is of opinion that the viśeṣadarśana cannot be accepted as a cause for the definite knowledge and he gives a perfect definition for cause[72]. For example if all the other accessories to give rise an effect - except one is existing,but the effect is not produced owing to the absence of that particular object. Hence the counterpositive of the absence is the cause i.e. the precedence of that counterpositive is required to give rise the effect. For example in the case of a pot, although there exist the kapāla, daṇḍa, cakra etc. but the effect does not come into existence in the absence of the maker (kulāla). So the maker (kulāla) the counterpositive of absence is the cause of a pot. Such precedence cannot be attributed to viseṣadharma to give rise a definite knowledge. The absence of viparītajñāna is a common cause for the production of the effect and in the example said before there exists the viparīta jñāna. So all causes with the absence of viparītajñāna is not available. Hence the viśesadarśana has only an indirect relationship in the production of a definite perceptual knowledge - such indirect precedents are accepted as "anyathā siddha-s".

The 'Pratibandhakatva' for 'viparītajñāna' is accepted in perception when these kinds of knowledge are arised through the help of same

senses (samanendriyajanya) and which is different from jñānalakṣaṇa. In the commentary the significance of the term "samanedriya janyatva' is given as follows. By visual organ there occurs a knowledge in the piece of a bamboo tree that it is a snake' - an invalid knowledge, then by tactual perception another valid knowledge occurs that it is not a snake, that kinds of knowledge are not considered as Viparīta jñānas (contradictory knowledge) because they are arised through the help of different senses[73]. Thus in the commentary the author explains all the topics of NRM along with other issues related to the subjects by accepting the technique called 'Ankura kalpana'. But in certain instances the ideas contained in the commentary are not so clear. The lengthening of the discussions also create difficulties for a common reader. But the erudite scholars who are well versed in all the śāstras can appreciate the ardent task of Śāstṛ śarman.

2. Avatārikā and Tippaṇi for Subodhini

Sāstr sarman wrote an avatārika (introduction to the subject) for Subodhini - the work composed by his friend Ramavarma Parīkṣit Tampuran. As noted before Subodhini is a sub commentary of Muktāvali, Dinakari, Rāmarudri, Prabhā and Manjuṣā commentaries. Śāstṛ śarman says that the Muktāvali of Viśwanātha Pancānana and its commentary

Prakāśa composed by Mahādeva has an important place among the Prakaraṇa works as that of Maṇi, Dīdhiti and Gādādhari among the works of 'Vāda Prasthāna'[74]. Although there exist other commentaries like Prabhā and Manjuṣā for this work they are eloquent in certain places and silent in other places. By the vast and very short interpretations the inner meaning of the concepts included by the original author cannot be understood. The Prakāśa commentary of Mahādeva is helpful to attain that purpose. The Rāmarudri or Taranginī commentary for Prakāśa is very much useful as it touches the vital point, but it is available only upto 'Śabdapariccheda'. The want of commentary for 'Gunakhānda' was a short coming for this treatise. Moreover the printed texts of 'Muktāvalī' contains many mistakes. SS says that the Subodhini - which bears the meaningful title is really an ornament to the Prakāśa commentary of Mahādeva. Although the Subodhini touches the 'Karikāvalī', 'Mukatāvalī', 'Rāmarudri', 'Prabhā' and 'Manjuṣā', interprets the ideas given by these commentaries, but the aim of the author is to establish the views of Mahādeva and the other commentaries are used as means for attaining this aim. The authors of Prabhā and Manjuṣā have rejected many opinions of Mahādeva and in certain places the views are explained only to refute. The Subodhini refuts the views of other authors with strong reasons. SS adds that PRV had gone through all the earlier manuscripts and the

correct reading is suggested by deep study and discussions with the court pandits.

SS admires the great task done by PRV and remarks that the author who has composed many other works like commentaries on Śakuntala etc many Stotras and Prabandhās is not only a logician but also a scholar in aesthetics. As an incidental idea SS says that the author of Subōdhini has some relations with the commentator, Mahādeva. Śeṣācārya the āsthanapaṇḍita and a native of Kumbhakoṇam was the Praśiṣya of Mahādeva and Śeṣācārya was an eminent scholar who tried to establish the views of his great teacher Mahādeva. RRV studied Nyāya from Śeṣācārya and PRV studied the Prakāśa commentary from RRV So the attempt of PRV to support the views of Mahādeva and to reject the views forwarded by the other commentaries is really a "Gurusaparyā"[75].

The Tippaṇi for Subōdhini is short notes given in the text as explanations to certain points. It is composed by SS by the request of the author viz. PRV. These works are the documents of friendship and respect between Śāstṛśārman and Parīkṣit Rāmavarma.

3. Tīkāprasūnāñjalī

Tīkāprasūnāñjalī is the commentary written by SS to his Gaṅgātaraṅgiṇī. It gives great help to understand the inner reference that are included in the stotra kāvya which contains a number of references stories and ritual practices. All the references included in the kāvya are taken from our ancient literature like vedas, itihāsas, purāṇas and smṛitis. Hence they cannot be remembered by a common reader without the help of this commentary.

Characteristics of the commentary

The author while explaining the first verse of Gaṅgātaraṅgiṇī writes that the gracefulness of Gaṅgā cannot be fully known even by gods. Without knowing, it is difficult to be described in verses, then the author adds that he praises the greatness by knowing something about her from the ancient stories contained in the Purāṇas. Hence in the commentary he tries to explain the verses of the kāvya with all such stories referred to in the original text. Thus the author accepts a new method to compose the commentary abandoning the general method of giving 'anvaya', 'artha' and explanations.

The salient feature of the commentary is that he explains the

terms of the verses with many citations from the ancient literature especially from the Śiva Purāṇa. The commentary of even a single verse contains a number of citations in praise of Gangā or Gangādhara. Hence the whole commentary is filled with such citations, references and stories. So the TPA is really a store house in which almost all the citations and references that deal with the greatness of Gangā and Gangādhara are collected. Two instances may be taken as examples to show this character of the commentary.

The greatness of Gangā is explained in many verses, among which in one verse he says that a person who had a mere touch, sight or chanting of the term. 'Gangā', her magnanimity is such that she will free that person from all his sins and gives emancipation. In the commentary the greatness is established with quotations from Garuḍa Purāṇa in which it is said that the touch, sight drinking water or reciting the term, 'Gangā' will purify even the sinful person. So it suggests to drink the water from that holy river who wants to cross the sea of wordly sufferings. The author adds that those who recite the name 'Gangā' through his Prāna or by Kaṇtha will go to the city of Viṣṇu after death and will not born again in the earth[76]. In another verse the term "Sāvitṛy" is used to signify the gracefulness of Gangā that she is powerful to fulfil all the wishes and to

give blessings to her devotees which can be attained through the worship of all the Gods. This power of Gangā is established with citations from Bhaviṣya purāna.

Another example is given below to show how he explains the greatness of Maṇikarṇikā the place for holy bath in Gangā. The citation is taken from Kāśikhaṇḍa - The greatness of Maṇikarṇikā is that, it is the best place for the holy bath because it is said, "it is true not wrong that there is not such holy water similar to Maṇikarṇikā in the whole world". "The blessings that can be attained by dipping the whole, waters of the holy places multipied by crores can be attained by dipping in the Maṇikarṇikā"[77]. Then he says that, more can be understood from Kāśikhaṇḍa where the greatness is elaborately discussed.

Explanations for stories

The stories that SS included in the commentary are numerous. The stories connected with the devine origin of Gangā are given in a number of places. The stories of persons who received blessings from Gangā and Gangādhara which are referred to in the kāvya are taken from the ancient literature. The author tries to explain all such stories and it is a chance for the author to exhibit his wholesome knowledge in

the 'vedas', 'purāṇas' and such other literature. In all the chapters the last verses which are devoted to praise Gangādhara contain various stories so the explanations for that verses seen in the commentary are very exhaustive and filled with a number of citations.

The story of Dharmaśāsta by whome the pride of Gods were destroyed through the partial 'avatāra' of Bhairava etc are elaborately discussed. The stories lika a cock who got emancipation by the devotion to Lord Śiva are explained elaborately in the commentary.

Explanations for ritualistic practices

Another important characteristic feature of the commentary is that it contains detailed explanations about the ritualistic practices to be followed for the worship of Śiva. The author was born and brought up in an atmosphere where all the ritualistic practices were strictly followed. He was educated in traditional method. Hence SS had first hand knowledge about the traditions and customes to be followed by a devotee. The author became an ardent devotee of Lord Śiva and an orthodox follower of all ritualistic practices. The importance of ritualistic practices like bearing 'bhasma' and 'rudrākṣa', five kinds of bath (panca snāna) Pradakṣiṇa and Bilvapatrārpaṇa are all explained in the commentary.

SS remarks that after regular bath a worshiper should bear 'mṛt' 'toya' and 'bhasma' for the destruction of calamities. About the bearing of 'rudrākṣa' the author says that it is as important as the bearing of bhasma and he gives the colours of rudrākṣa for the members of different casts. The author writes that Brāhmaṇa, kṣatriya, etc are to wear the colours of white, red, yellow and black respectively. If the above colours are not available another colours can be accepted. Thus kṣatriya can bear three colours beginning from red, vaiśya can bear that of two colours from yellow and for śūdra it is black. The author is of opinion that the devotees should bear the 'rudrākṣa' before worship, otherwise there will not have the accomplishment of desired result[78]. Many quotations are given by the author for supporting this view.

At the end of the kāvya the author gives the nature of a true devotee as one who bears praises in his mouth, meditation in his heart, 'añjali' in hands and 'pradakṣiṇa' in his feet.

Philosophical explanations

S.S. was an eminent scholar in Indian logic and he had composed many works in this śāstra. The author was commonly known as Tārkikatilaka. But from the perusal of the commentary it feels that he is an erudite scholar in all the systems of Indian philosophy especially in

Advaita vedānta. The concepts of Advaita are used in numerous instances. The theories of other systems are also utilised to explain many verses of the kāvya.

The famous theory of Nyāya that the earth, sprout etc. are created by a creator because it is a product like a pot (क्षित्यङ्कुरादिकं कर्तृजन्यं कार्यत्वात् घटवत्) is applied to establish the God as the creator of this world. Through this inference the Naiyāyika says that if there is a product it must have a creator (kartā). Kartā is defined as one who has the direct knowledge about the causes and who is having the desire and actions to create the object. Hence an individual cannot be considered as the creator of the earth beacause their knowledge is limited. So the creatorship is attributed to the omniscient and omnipotent God. The commentator uses this theory to attribute the creatorship of the world to Lord Śiva.

The Advaita concept that the 'Brahma' as the upādānakāraṇa of the world is applied in many places. In the first verse of the sixth taranga the origin of Gangā is described with references of the Advaita vedānta. The commentator says that, she got the origin from the feet of Viṣṇu and flows through the different parts of the earth like the holy words of Śrī Śankarācārya in the form of Vedānta sūtra bhāṣya which is the essence

of Veda. It is propogated to various directions by his famous disciples viz. Padmapāda, Toṭaka, Hastāmalaka and Sureśa. They preached the identity of Jīvātma and Paramātma i.e Advayabrahma.

A number of etymology of the terms are given in the commentary. For example the word Śiva is explained as 'Śivamasyāsti' - with whom the purity resides, or śivamkaroti ie he who gives 'mangala' to the world or Śivaśuddhaḥ - who is pure or gives purity for all. Then the term Paśupati is explained as - Paśupati is Rudra. All the objects from souls to even a small pillar are to be considered as 'Paśu' and 'Śiva' the protector of these, is called Paśupati. He explains this character of Śiva with many citations from Harivaṁśa.

A humble son before the Mother Gaṅgā

Being a talented and imaginative poet and an erudite scholar in all the systems of philosophy, veda, itihāsa and purāṇa our author is very humble before the mother Gaṅgā. In the first verse itself he admits that he tries to describe her by the stories that he heard from the purāṇas and requests the mother to forgive his adventure. In another verse he remarks that there are many stōtras like Gaṅgālahari, Gaṅgāṣṭava etc which contains praises and prayers to Goddess Gaṅgā. He accepts that the authors of such works are very much talented than him. They are

able to compose stotras instantly and SS admits his inferiority in talent (vigatavāsanoham). Then our author mentions that by composing kāvyas hastely they cannot meditate upon the Goddess, but he composed the poem by meditating upon her greatness. Hence he shows the devotion and requests blessings of the mother to help him and that is the reason for composing the work Gangātaranginī. Through this work the author shows his humility before the mother Gangā in many other occasions also.

Thus the commentary TPA is really a contribution from a devotee of Lord Śiva written for the sake of other devotees. The author explains his own feelings and experiences to describe the Gangā and Gangādhara. The elaborate explanations, numerous stories and citations included in the commentary are very much attractive for those who want to know more about Gangā. The descriptions of the ritual practices contained in the commentary will defenitely be admired by the devotees. But sometimes the citations included in the commentary are more than the needful. Moreover as the 'anvaya' or 'artha' of the verses are not included in the commentary, a common reader feels difficult to understand the meaning of the verses. Even then the hard effort in collecting a number of citations and references, and including them in the appropriate places of the commentary is admirable.

References:

1. स्तवोऽयं स्वयं रमणीयत्वात्, रमणीयार्थ प्रतिपादकत्वाच्च सत्काव्यरसिकानामत्यन्तमाह्लादमुत्पादयतीत्यत्र न संशयलेशः Gangātaranginī - Abhipraya of Pariksit Ramavarma

2. इति भक्तिमात्रमवलम्ब्य वक्ति यत्
सुविनीतशिष्यपरमाणुरच्युतः
अपि शब्दतो विकल्पमर्थतोपि तद्गुरू-
रुपदैवतमुदे भवेद्ध्रुवम् // Ibid, Avatārika, p.VIII

3. Kumārasambhava XI, (4-15)

4. Raghuvamśa X, (16-32)

5. Śisupālavadha XIV, (59-86)

6. For details see Sanskrita sahitya caritra, vol. II, p-284

7. See article Stotrakavyas, T.P. Balakrsnan Nair and Dr. K. Kunjunniraja, Ibid, p.p. 284-311

8. आहृत्यान्यकवीश्वरैर्विरचिताः सूक्तीः सुधास्यन्दिनीः
कृत्वा वर्णपदादि भेदकल्पनैर्यत्नाद्विरूपाकृतीः ।
मातस्त्वत्पादपद्मयोरुपहरोम्यारोप्य चात्मीयतां
कारुण्यान्मम साहसं जडमतेरेतत्त्वया क्षम्यताम् // GT XXIV, -14

9. आदौ पङ्कजयोनिना स्वनियमव्यापारपात्रे शुभे
संगृह्याथ शुचौ महाबलिजितः पादारविन्देऽर्पिता ।
पश्चात्वं परिपावनेन शिरसा सम्भाविता शम्भुना
शैलेन्द्रेण च भाग्यतः पुनरिलं प्राप्तसि भागीरथि // 1.6

10. Ibid, XVI - 9

11. *निजाङ्कं यातेभ्यो भवदहनतापोदिततृषा*
परामृश्यालोलैश्शिशिरतरवीचीकरतलैः ।
त्रिलोकमातस्त्वं प्रदिशसि परं वत्सलमनाः
पयः स्वं माधुर्यप्रशमितसुधाहङ्कृति भरम् ॥ Ibid, V 7

12. *नमोऽस्तु ते सत्यनिकेतनायै नमोऽस्तु ते*
जाह्नवि विष्णुपद्यै ।
नमोऽस्तु ते शम्भुजटाञ्चितायै नमोऽस्तु ते
सागरसङ्गतायै ॥ Ibid, XVII - 11

13. Ibid, IV 9

14. *सप्तर्षिकृतसारे दुर्वाराधौघभङ्गकृत्सारे ।*
कृतनतकरुणासारे वन्दे विख्यातनिम्नगासारे ॥ Ibid, XII 6

15. Ibid, VI - I & VII - 1

16. *युक्तस्यास्य सदा व्यवस्थितदिशावेलानिमित्तक्रिया -*
भाव्यैः कर्तृपभोक्तृभिश्च विविधैर्नाम्ना च रूपेण च ।
संवीक्ष्यैव हृदाप्यचिन्त्यरचनारुपस्य लीलामयी
चिच्छक्तेर्जननि व्यनक्ति जगतः सृष्टिस्तव प्राभवम् ॥ Ibid, 1.2

17. Ibid, V 11

18. *ओतप्रोतमिदं गुणेष्विव पटो वैराजरूपे गिरि -*
ग्रामारण्य पुरीनदाब्धिनृपतत्पश्वादिरूपं जगत् ।
कोणे क्वापि विहायसस्तदपि तत् प्राहुर्यदंशे शिवे
तत्वं तत्वमसीत्युदाहरति कस्तावन्महत्वन्तव ॥ Ibid, 1-3

19. *यच्छन्त्येव परं परात् परतरं देवा हरीशादयः*
सत्यं दीर्घतरेण कृच्छ्तपसा ध्यानेन योगेन वा।
अल्पे चायुषि दुर्बले च वपुषि स्वान्ते च लोले नृणां
स्नानेनैव विमुक्तिदासि शरणं गङ्गे कलौ केवलम् ॥ Ibid, 1.5

20. *ब्रह्मघ्नैर्गुरुतल्पगैरपहृतस्वर्णैस्सुरापायिभि-*
र्वर्षं तत्सहवासिभिश्च सहसा निर्भर्त्स्य दूरीकृताः।
ये वा सन्ति तदीयपापनिवहानुन्मूलयन्ती सदा
प्यश्रान्ता जयसि त्वमेव भुवनेष्वेका भवद्वेषिणी ॥ Ibid, 1.10

21. Ibid, II -3

22. Ibid, V -4

23. *दुर्वारामयपीडिता गदहरैस्त्यक्तास्तथा बन्धुभि-*
र्निर्वेदोपहताशया बहिरिव स्वान्ते तपन्तो भृशम्।
त्वामेकां शरणं प्रपद्य बहवो यान्ति स्थिरोल्लाघता
मन्ते चाप्यमृतं विमुक्तिनगरीमुक्तालये दुर्लभम् ॥ Ibid, II - 4

24. Ibid, IV - 3

25. *कुष्ठादिदुस्तरगदेषु किल स्वभाव-*
सिद्धौषधिप्रकर सारभरप्रभावम् ।
पेयं तवातिमधुरं सलिलञ्च लेपो
मृत्स्ना च जप्यमपि जाह्नवि नामधेयम् ॥ Ibid, XIV - 4

26. *चञ्चत्पुष्पायुधजयपटीचारुहासाच्छफेन-*
व्याकीर्णोद्यद्वदनसुषमासञ्चय क्षीरसिन्धौ।
पक्रीडन्ती विबुधतटिनि त्वत्कटाक्षेन्द्रनील-
न्याप्यानन्दं व्रजति परमं पारमेशाक्षिलक्ष्मीः ॥ Ibid, VIII - 5

27. फुल्लन्मल्लीकुसुमसुषमं पौरूषं मान्मथीयं
तारानाथप्रतिमवदनं शम्भुसम्भोगयोग्यम्।
शैलेत्तुङ्गस्तनभरनतं पादसञ्जत्सुकेशं
पश्येयं ते सुरधुनि कदा दिव्यकाम्यं स्वरूपम् ॥ Ibid, VIII - 11

28. Ibid, 1.12

29. Ibid, 6.11

30. गङ्गे कपर्दाद्बहिरुत्पतन्ती वेणी तवाभाति
वराङ्कभाजा
करेण गौर्याऽरूणदृष्टि भूयो व्याक्ष्यप्यमाणा-
म्बुजमालिनीव, Ibid, VI.1

31. Ibid, IV . 4

32. अनाचरो दूरे श्रुतिविहितकर्माणि निखिल-
न्यसत्सङ्गी हित्वा बत विगतलज्जः पशुरिव।
भ्रमन् भोगासक्तस्सुरधुनि भवद्भक्तितरणिं
विना संसाराब्धिं कथमिव तरेयं कुरू कृपाम् ॥ Ibid, V. 10

33. यत्र श्रीहरिशङ्करौ निवसतः सायुज्यदौ वादिना -
वन्योन्यं सुकृतेन केनचिदहो प्राप्तस्तवैतत्तटम्।
स्नानं श्रीमणिकर्णिके पितृगणैः स्वीयेस्त्वयि प्रार्थितं
कुर्वे तत्र वितीर्यतामनुमतिर्दासाय मह्यं त्वया ॥ Ibid, I - 11

34. Ibid, 2.10

35. सञ्चिन्त्यान्त्यामवस्थां बहुलकफकृतश्वासरोधैरसह्यां
कष्टां नाहं बिभेमि त्रिदशधुनि परैः सर्वथा दुर्निवाराम् ।
यत्तावत् सन्निधाय ध्रुवमुरुकृपया चालयिष्यस्यशङ्कं
दासेऽस्मिन् पाणिपत्मं प्रबलभवमहारोगसिद्धौषधाग्रयम् ॥ Ibid, IV. 5

36. Ibid, XII . 10

37. *अम्बापराधमखिलं दयया क्षमस्व*
संसारघोरतरसागरगाढमग्नम् ।
स्वर्लोकवाहिनि समुद्धर मामनन्य-
नाथं तवाङ्घ्रिकमलं शरणं गतोऽस्मि ॥ Ibid, XXIV. 13

38. *नमोऽस्तु जगदम्ब ते पदसरोरुहे निश्चलं*
मनस्तु शशिभास्वरे वपुषि लोचनेऽभ्यर्चने ।
करौ स्तुतिविधौ वचो विविधसत्कथासु श्रुती
प्रदक्षिणविधौ पदे परमितो न याचे मनाक् ॥ Ibid, XIV.15

39. Ibid, VIII . 13

40. *समुद्भुता विष्णोः पदसरसिजाज्जन्मशमनी*
महीभेदान् प्राप्ता सुरतटिनि साहस्रकमुखी ।
त्रयीसाराधारा जयसि विमला शङ्करगुरो-
र्मुखाब्जादाचार्यान् भणितिरिव तत्वाद्वयपरा ॥ Ibid, VI . 1

41. Ibid, XII . 2

42. Ibid, VIII . 6

43. Ibid, VIII . 7

44. Anuprāsa is seen in almost all verses, particularly see, ibid, VII . 3 & VIII . 13

45. *साङ्गमिति - सर्वज्ञतादीनि षडङ्गानि, तत्सहितमित्यर्थः तथा च सर्वज्ञता, तृप्तिरनादिबोधः, स्वतन्त्रता नित्यमलुप्तशक्तिः । अनन्तशक्तिश्च विभोर्विधिज्ञाः षडाहुरङ्गानि महेश्वरस्य ।* Tīkāprasūnāñjali, p-96

46. त्रिभुवनमखिलं यद्व्याप्तमित्यादरेण
प्रणमति शतरुद्री पावनी वेदसारः।
अपि च बहुविधं यद्विश्वविश्वाधिपत्यं
प्रथयति भज चेतस्तं सदा काशिकेशम् ॥ Viśwanāthāṣṭaka, sl. I

47. Cātakasandeśa of Panditaraja Māntiṭṭa Śāstṛ śarman - edited by Dr. P.C. Muralimadhavan, p-XXIV

48. CS Uttarabhāgaḥ, sl. 70

49. यत्रारम्भे हरिहरममुं साधुवन्दस्व देवं
लक्ष्मीगौरीपरिचरणया साधिताद्वैतसौख्यम् ।
प्रातः स्नातः स्वरसुखशिरकम्पसम्भावितार्था
मुद्राहस्ताः श्रुतिभिरभितोयं भजन्ते द्विजेन्द्राः ॥ Ibid, Pūrvabhaga, sl. 9

50. Ibid, 12

51. Ibid, 18

52. Ibid, 20

53. Ibid, 23

54. Ibid, 34

55. Ibid, 49

56. Ibid, 35-46

57. Ibid, 46

58. Ibid, 56

59. Ibid, 59

60. Ibid, 73

61. यं प्रागेत्य स्वयमुतहरिस्तीर्थयात्राप्रसङ्गे
साकं वीणारसिकमुनिना वेणुगानप्रवीणः ।
चक्रे गीतं सरसमधुरं स्कन्दकीर्तिप्रदानं
तेन ख्यातोऽजनि हरिसङ्गीतनाम्ना प्रदेशः ॥ Ibid, Uttarabhāga. 3

62. Ibid, 25-27

63. For more details see CS, op.cit

64. NRM, p-107

65. आत्मनो वै शरीराणि बहूनि मनुजेश्वर ।
प्राप्ययोगबलं कुर्यात्तैश्च कृत्स्नं महीं चरेत्॥
भुञ्जीत विषयान् कैश्चित् कैश्चिदुग्रं तपश्चरेत्
संहरेच्च पुनस्तानि सूर्यस्तेजोगणानिव॥ NUA, p-108

66. अवश्यमेव भोक्तव्यं कृतं कर्म शुभाशुभम्
नाभुक्तं क्षीयते कर्म कल्पकोटि शतैरपि ॥ Ibid, p.109

67. तत्वज्ञाननाश्यतावच्छेदकजातिः स्वजन्य पुण्यविशेषव्यावृत्तैवेति न तत्वज्ञानस्य पुण्यविशेष-जनकत्वानुपपत्तिः Ibid, p.110

68. न च तत्वज्ञानेन कर्मणामविनाशे ज्ञानिनामात्यन्तिकदुःखनिवृत्यसम्भवेन 'तरति शोकमात्मवित्', "दुःखेनात्यन्तं विमुक्तश्चरति" इत्याद्यनेकश्रुतिविरोध इति वाच्यम् । Ibid, p.111

69. श्रुतिस्मृत्यन्यथानुपपत्या काश्यां मृतानापि क्षणमात्रेण निखिलकर्मोपभोगक्षममायामशरीराभ्युपगमेन भोगानुपपत्ति विरहात् Ibid, p.113

70. कर्म त्रिविधम् - प्रारब्धं, सञ्चितमागामि चेति यत्र वर्तमानशरीरं यत्कर्मजन्यं तत् प्रारब्धम्, तद्भिन्नं वर्तमानं कर्म सञ्चितम् । जनिष्यमाणं कर्म आगामि। तत्र प्रारब्धस्य भोगादेव क्षयः। 'नाभुक्तम्' इत्यादि वचनानि तद्विषयाणि। सञ्चितस्य च ज्ञानादित एव क्षय तत्पराणि "क्षीयन्ते चास्य कर्माणि" इत्यादि वाक्यानि। आगामिनस्तु ज्ञानमहिम्ना न संश्लेषः। तत्तात्पर्यकञ्च तद्यथा पुष्परपलाशो आपो न श्लिष्यन्ते इत्यादि। Ibid, p.p. 115-116

71. केचित्तु विरोधिनिश्चयानन्तरं ग्राह्यसंशयानन्तरञ्च विना ग्राह्यव्याप्यवत्ताज्ञानं पुरुषत्वादि निश्चयो नोत्पद्यते, सति तु तस्मिन् जायते - NRM, p-166

72. स्वव्यतिरिक्त निखिलकारणसत्व समानकालीन कार्यव्यतिरेकप्रयोजकी भूताभावप्रतियोगिन एव कारणत्वम् NUA, p.p. - 166-167

73. चक्षुषा वंशे उरगत्वभ्रमेऽपि त्वचा तत्र तदभावग्रहात् समानेन्द्रियजन्यत्व निवेशनम् Ibid, p -167

74. प्रस्थानद्वयोऽपि न्यायशास्त्रस्य सत्स्वपि बहुषु ग्रन्थेषु वादप्रस्थाने मणिदीधिति गादधरीयाणमिव अस्ति परमाभ्यर्हितं स्थानं प्रकरणेषु श्रीविश्वनाथन्यायपञ्चानन भट्टाचार्याणां कृते निजनिर्मितकारिकावल्येविवरण रूपायासिद्धान्तमुक्तावल्याः तद्व्याख्यनस्य च महादेवभट्टविरचितस्य प्रकाशस्य । Avatarika to Subodhini, Sastr sarman.

75. अतश्च परैरुद्भावितानि दूषणानि समुद्धृत्य प्रकाशस्याशयप्रकाशने तत्प्रामाण्य समर्थने च सुबोधिनीकृत्तामयमुद्यम समुचिता गुरुसपर्यापि भवति। Ibid, p III

76. स्पर्शनदर्शनादिभिरिति - न केवलं स्पर्शनेनेत्यर्थः, आदिना स्मरणकीर्तनादीनां ग्रहणम्। तदुक्तं गरुडपुराणे, नद्यो जलावगाहेन पावयन्तीत राजनात्, दर्शनात् स्पर्शनात् पानात् तथा गङ्गेति कीर्तनात्, पुनात्यपुण्यात् पुरुषान् शतशोऽथ सहस्रशः गङ्गा, तस्मात्पिबेत्तस्या जलं संसारतारकम्, गङ्गा गङ्गेति यो ब्रूयात् प्राणैः कण्ठगतैरपि, मृतो विष्णुपुरं याति न पुनर्जायते भुवि॥ TPA, 1.4

77. सत्यं सत्यं पुन सत्यपूर्वमिदं वचः, मणिकर्णिकासमं तीर्थं नास्ति ब्रह्माण्डलोके, सर्व तीर्थावगाहाञ्च यत् पुण्यं स्यान्नृणामिह, तत् पुण्यं कोटिगुणितं मणिकर्णिकामज्जनात् इत्यादिवचनात्। Ibid, 1.11

78. नित्यस्नानान्तरमितियावत् दुरितहरमृत्तोयभसितैरित्यत्राप्येतत् सम्बध्यते। अत्र क्रमो विवक्षितः पूर्व मृदा, तत्र जलेन अनन्तरं भस्मनेति। स्नानानि पञ्च पुण्यानि कीर्तितानि महर्षिभि आग्नेयं, वारुणं ब्राह्मं वायव्यं दिव्यमेव च। रुद्राक्षञ्च ब्राह्मणादिभिः क्रमेण श्वेतरक्तपीतकृष्णवर्णं ग्राह्यम् । Ibid, VI.8

CHAPTER VII
CONCLUSION

Nacaratnamālikā of Śāstṛ śarman, popularly known as Panditarājan Māntiṭṭa Kunju Nampootiri, can reasonably be considered as a typical treatise on Navya Nyāya modelled by a 'Karkaśa Naiyāyika'. The subject matter and the method of treatment of the work establishes the fact that the author is an astute logician, excelently trained in the traditional method of study. The theme of the text is 'Vyāpti' coming under Anumāna which is one of the most important topics discussed in the Nyāya śāstra. The importance and difficulty to formulate a perfect definition to 'vyāpti' can easily be inferred from the numerous definitions available in this śāstra.

Gangeśopādhyāya, the author of the famous Tattvacintāmaṇi, first enumerates five definitions of 'vyāpti' known as 'vyāptipañcaka' formulated by early logicians. Then he adds fourteen definitions known as 'Caturdaśalakṣaṇi' which approve 'Vyadhikaraṇadharmāvacchinnābhāva' and finally gives his own view point as Siddhānta lakṣaṇa. The author of NRM has selected for the theme of his work, "Pragalbhalakṣaṇa" which is one among the fourteen definitions (Caturdaśalakṣaṇi)[1]. Although

this definition is briefly interpreted by the previous commentators of TC, the method followed in the NRM is different from the same.

The style of the work, NRM, is like that of higher dissertations in Nyāya works known as 'kroḍa patra-s'[2]. The 'kroḍa patra-s' are written to explain certain sentences that occur in the original text but they cannot be considered as commentaries because they do not explain each and every sentences of the text. The authors of the 'kroḍapatra-s' touch the original text only in the beginning and then give explanations of their own. S S begins the text by raising objections to the explanations given to the various terms of the definition and goes on rejecting any modification or clarification by pointing out the loopholes in it. When he thus reaches a stage beyond which no further objection is possible, he comes out with his own solutions.

The significant title of the text "Nacaratnamālikā" is indicative of the charecteristic features of the work. 'Naca', the common term used in the beginning of a sentence to denote that it is an objection, is seen in all the śāstra works, with the term, 'vācyam' at the end. NRM contain ninety eight 'Naca-s' which are figuratively represented as jewels in a necklace. The objections and answers related to the definition, forms the content of the text. The intellectual excellence with which the author

detects defects and offers solutions to rectify the same is superb and is of a high level which nobody can even think of[3].

The language used in the NRM is full of numerous technical terms like 'avacchedaka' 'avacchinna', 'pratiyogin', 'anuyogin', 'ādhāra', 'ādheya', 'ādharatā', 'ādheyatā' and so on. A number of theories and techniques of 'Navya Nyāya' are found adopted and applied in the text by the author in order to make the treatment subtle and comprehensive[4]. Each and every term of the definition is taken seperately and the meaning intended by the terms is given with more than one explanation along with the specification of defects that linger under the various shades of meaning.

It may not be out of place here to take examples from the text to show the 'karkaśatva' of the author as a Naiyāyika. The first term of the definition 'yatsamānādhikaraṇa' is discussed elaborately with the three shades of meaning viz. 'yannirūpitādhikaraṇatāvad vṛttitvam', 'yanniṣṭhā-dheyatānirūpakavṛttitvam', and 'yanniṣṭhādheyatā nirūpitādhikaraṇatāvad vṛttitvam'. All these explanations are refuted by the author pointing out defects by means of a keen investigation[5]. In the second 'āvalī' the 'sādhyābhāva' which coexists in the locus of 'hetu' is also explained in the same style i.e 'hetvadhikaraṇanirūpitādheyatva rūpam', 'hetvadhikaraṇa

niṣṭhādhikaraṇata nirūpakatva rūpam' and hetvadhikaraṇa niṣṭhādhikaraṇatā nirūpitādheyatārūpam'[6]. These three shades of meaning are left out by pointing the untenability of each of them.

The various concepts and methodology found applied and adopted in the text also establishes the strictness (karkaśatva) of the author as a Naiyāyika to whom application of Navya Nyāya concepts in appropriate places forms an interesting hobby. An example for this is the second explanation, given to the term 'yatsamānādhikaraṇa', as follows - 'yanniṣṭhādeyatā nirūpaka vṛttitva'[7]. It can be applied in a valid inference only by one who had mastered the Navya Nyāya concepts like 'ādheya', 'ādheyatā', 'adhikaraṇa', 'adhikaraṇatā', 'nirūpita' and 'nirūpaka'. The application of the explanation is done in the inference "Mountain possesses fire as it possesses smoke". 'Yat' denotes the hetu smoke, because the application of 'vyāpti' should be done in the 'hetu' and 'vyāpti' is the property of 'hetu'. The 'hetu' which exists in the mountain can be considered as the 'ādheya' and 'ādheyatā' rests (niṣṭha) in the smoke. Hence 'Yanniṣṭhādheyatā' means the 'ādheyatā' which rests in the 'hetu'. The next concept is that, as the smoke rests in a locus viz. in the mountain, it is the 'adhikaraṇa' and 'adhikaraṇatā' is the special property of 'adhikaraṇa'. Hence it is accepted that the smoke and mountain acquired

the respective properties called 'ādheyatā' and 'adhikaraṇatā'. Mere smoke or mountain are not called 'ādheya' or 'adhikaraṇa'. These properties are the acquired properties (ārjita dharma) and 'ādheyatā' and 'adhikaraṇatā' are mutually dependent. The mutual relationship is called described describer relationship (nirūpya nirūpaka bhāva) i.e. 'ādheyatānirūpitā adhikaraṇatā'. In the example noted above the 'ādheyatā nirūpaka' (describer of the superstratumness) is the 'adhikaraṇa' i.e the mountain. Hence as per the explanation (of yatsamānādhikaraṇa) 'yanniṣṭhādheyatānirūpaka' is the mountain and the 'vṛttitva' (existence) of 'sādhyābhāva' in the nature of an opposed substratum (vyadhikaraṇadharmāvacchinna) is seen in the mountain. The 'vyadhikaraṇadharama' refers to a property which does not exist in that object. For example the absence of fire limited with potness (ghaṭatvena vahnyabhāva) in which the counterpositive (pratiyogin) fire is limited with the property ghatatva (vyadhikaraṇadharma). This special kind of 'vahnyabhāva' exists even in the locus where the fire exists. So there is 'sāmānādhikaraṇanya'. The 'sādhyābhāva' i.e the absence of fire limited with potness, does not obstruct the 'sādhyavattājñāna' i.e there is fire. Hence the application of the definition by the explanation given by SS is possible.

Another characteristic feature of the text is the method of dealing topics with hair splitting subtelety. Instances are abundantely found in NRM. An example can be seen when the author points out 'Avyāpti' in the explanation given for 'yatsamānādhikaraṇa'. The concept, 'prakāratā viśeṣyatayoriva adhārādheyatvayorapi nirūpya nirūpaka bhāva' is adopted to find out the defect. The idea is that the 'prakāratā' and 'viśeṣyatā' are related by 'nirūpya' 'nirūpaka bhāva' (described describer relation) similarly the 'adhāratva' and 'adheyatva' are also related by the same way. Here an 'Avyāpti' is detected by the author in the inference. 'The mountain possesses fire as it possesses smoke'. In this inference 'yat' denotes 'hetu' smoke and as it is the 'ādheya', 'ādheyatā' rests in the smoke. 'Adheyatānirūpaka' (describer of the superstratumness) is the 'adhāratā' (locusness) i.e the mountainness (parvatatva) not the mountain, 'parvatatva' is a property, not a substance and fire cannot exist in that property. So the 'sādhyābhāvapramā' is in the form of 'Parvataniṣṭhā-dhikaraṇatā vahnyabhāvavān' - the 'adhikaraṇatā' existing in the mountain possesses the absence of fire. This valid knowledge is capable to obstruct the 'sādhyavattā jñāna' that there exists fire. Hence 'Avyāpti' occurs in the typical example[8]. This type of analysis is seen in the whole text. The defects are cleared with insertions wherever possible and only after detailed discussion the most suitable explanation is selected by the author.

Now let us turn our attention to the accademic significance of the circumstances of the composition of NRM.

SS was fortunate enough to experience a highly excellent accademic atmosphere right from his childhood. His father was a vedic scholar from whom the author got his primary education. The author had his vedic studies in the 'Brahmaswam maṭhom' at Trissur which was a famous centre where the vedas were studied traditionally. His higher studies were conducted in 'Kodungallur Guṛukulam' where many great kings and well known scholars of deep edudition were the preceptors. Deep study in the different branches of Sanskrit learning were carried out there. The teacher in Nyāya was Godavarma Bhaṭṭan Tampurān, a well known Nyāya scholar and composer of many works in the different fields of Sanskrit learning. SS was the best vessel (supātṛa) in which such learned preceptors could impart their wholesome knowledge.

Thus the atmosphere in the Kodungallur Gurukula was very much favourable for the development of the authors high intellectual powers. S.S made use of all the favourable conditions and achieved a strong base in the Nyāya śāstṛa. Even from childhood he was able to participate in the 'Śāstra sadas' - the traditional venue where the scholars display their super intelligence to win the recognition of erudite and reputed

scholars. The rules, to be followed in a 'Śāstra sadas' for the presentation of a topic, are described in the 'Nyāya sūtra' of Gautama and the author was quite well-versed in this regard. The deep knowledge of SS was recognised and appreciated by all the contemporary scholars and gradually he became an authority in Nyāya śāstra.

The appointment of SS as the first Nyāya teacher in the Śeṣacārya Mahāpāṭhaśāla, Tripunithura was the turning point in his intellectual development. The Mahāpāṭhaśāla was established and maintained by Rājarṣi Rāmavarman the king of Erstwhile Cochin state to preserve the treasure of ancient learning. This institution was well maintained by the successive rulers of RRV. The rulers of the Cochin royal family were always in the front to give encouragement to the scholars. The propogation and preservation of the ancient śāstras were regarded as their duty (dharma). Hence the palace, wherein the 'Pāṭhaśāla' was functioning, always enjoyed the presence of eminent scholars. The scholars like Cennamangalam Ayyā Śāstrikal an authority in Vyākaraṇa, Sahṛdayatilakan K. Rāma pisaroty an authority in Sāhitya, Setumādhavadeekṣitar a traditional Nyāya scholar, were some of the gifted personalities who adorned the Cochin Royal Palace at that time.

The annual 'Śāstra sadas' established by RRV, gave opportunities

for scholars to evaluate their erudition and winners of the 'sadas' were fortunate enough to get high recognitions and titles of honour like 'Panditarāja', Tārkikatilaka' etc. In addition, the discussions on various topics of śāstra were held occasionaly in the palace and all the scholars got an opportunity to have their participation in the same.

The Nyaya scholars outside Kerala were also recognised and appointed as Nyāya teachers in the royal palace. A reputed Nyāya scholar Śeṣācāryar from Kumbhakoṇam was the 'parama guru' of RRV. His grandson Setumādhavadeekṣitar, who was an expert in analysing 'vāda grandha-s' was another scholar to be mentioned here. SS occasionally mentions the help Setumādhavadeekṣitar rendered to him to enter the hard and tough 'Vāda grandha-s' and 'kroda patra-s'[9]. The discussions on the knotty points of different śāstrās were done in a sportive spirit by those eminent scholars who devoted their whole life for the cause of knowledge.

PRV the last ruler of Erstwhile Cochin state and a well known Nyaya scholar was the classmate and friend of SS. His highness remarks in the 'Bhūmika' of NRM that, in Tattvacintāmaṇi, Dīdhiti or in its elaborate interpretations one cannot point out a topic which is not discussed by the court scholars even by sitting late in right[10].

The participation of reputed scholars outside Kerala in the 'Śāstra Sadas' was an encouragement for the native scholars. Nyāya scholars like Rāmaśāstri, Śadakopācārya, Setumādhava deekṣitar, the natives of Kumbhakoṇam deserve mention here. The presence of these scholars in the sadas necessitated a deep and thorough excellence in the subject for the native scholars to gain recognition. Acyuta Potuvāl in his introduction to Gaṅgātaraṅgiṇī says that the aged Srinivāsācārya, a native of Kāncipura who was known as 'Śingalācārya', a terror to paṇḍits, was defeated by Śāstṛ Śarman, who thereby won the title of honour 'Tārkika tilaka' from the Mahārāja of Cochin[11].

Śarma's family members were also responsible for the development of his intellectual powers. His wife, Kochukāvu Tampurāti was a scholar and receipient of the title of honour 'Paṇḍitarāja'. She was a member of Kodungallur Kovilakam wherein all the members of the family were renowned scholars. So Śarma got, as his wife, a co-sharer in his intellectual activities.

SS was a teacher fortunate enough to have many devoted disciples. Scholars like C.K. Raman Nambiar, T Rama warrier and K. Achyuta Potuval were his disciples who were enthusiastic enough to write a commentary to the preceptor's work NRM. They were awarded

the title of honour 'Panditarāja' by the king of Cochin. SS as well as his disciples considered learning as part of their teaching and they viewed teaching as a 'Saraswatī pooja'. It is heard that even after retirement SS remained in the palace as an 'Asthāna paṇḍita'.

The author of NRM made the best use of all the favourable atmosphere he got from the Cochin royal family. The basic knowledge in Nyāyaśāstra which he got from Kodungallur Gurukulam was deepened by the accademic atmosphere prevalent in Tripunithura. The hard work of the author combined with the encouragement received from the kings, scholars and disciples paved the way for the composition of a work like NRM. The deep learning, discussions, teaching and speculations on all the topics of Nyāya Śāstra shaped his intellect as a 'Karkaśa Tārkika' - a strict logician and that karkaśatva (strictness) in dealing subjects is clearly discernable in NRM. The influence of the 'Śāstra Sadas' is also evident in the method of treatment followed in the text by way of proposing and opposing various viewpoints.

The reasons for the unpopularity of the text may be traced as follows

NRM is a scholarly work and thereby it is a contribution of Kerala

to the field of Nyāyaśāstra. Though the work is published by the Vice Chancellor, Vāraṇaseya Sanskrit Viśvavidyālaya, Vāranasi in the year 1965, it is not yet published from Kerala and hence the copies are not available here. The unavailability of the text can be pointed out as a reason for the unpopularity of the treatise. Another reason can be the author's style containing long long sentences in Navya Nyāya language involving many concepts and theories. Insertion of indirect and incidental topics is abundantly found in this work. In certain cases the discussion of a topic is changed to certain indirect subjects whereby the reader is prone to think that the author is deliberately creating chances to show his extra ordinary brilliance in dealing the subjects adopting the Navya Nyāya methodology. Examples for such treatment are many among which two are pointed out here. The final explanation for the term 'yat-samānādhikaraṇa' is given with an insertion of the term 'svaniṣṭha hetutāvacchedakāvacchinnādheyatā nirūpitatva', then the next topic is, a discussion about the 'hetutāvacchedakāvacchinnatva'. An inference is given as example to show the relevance of this insertion. The example given is 'ghatah dravyam viśiṣtha sattvād', where the 'hetutāvacchedakā-vacchinnatva' is needed to solve the defect called 'Avyāpti'. The author takes a deviation here to discuss in all its details the 'hetutāvacchedaka sambandha' in an inference where the 'hetu' is a qualified generality (viśiṣṭa-

sattā)[12]. The one third portion of the first āvalī is devoted to a discussion in this regard.

Another example can be cited from the third 'āvalī' wherein the 'Vyadhikaraṇadharmāvacchinna pratiyogikābhāva' is taken as the obstructor for the 'Sādhyavattājñāna'[13] because it is a factor which includes the "pratyakṣa sāmagri'. Here the author says that if the knowledge of Vyadhikaraṇadharmāvacchinnābhāva' is produced after doubt this 'pratyakṣasāmagri' is capable to obstruct the anumiti since 'pratyakṣasāmagri' is stronger than 'anumānasāmagri'. Now the author proceeds to dwell on the topics, doubt and 'viśeṣadarśana' thereby deviating from the topic under discussion. The author here gives an elaborate discussion with arguments and counter arguments on these topics having only incidental importance.

Although these facts can be considered as negative factors obstructing the popularity of the work, the genuine reason for the unpopularity of the text is that no one has taken pains to study the text. The common belief is that this work is not accessible to an ordinary reader. It is true that a common reader cannot have an easy access to this work but for one who had acquainted with the methodology of the Navya Nyāya, the study of the text will be quite interesting. A thorough

footing in Nyāya is needed to appreciate the text in Navya Nyāya and the same can be attained only by way of deep learning, teaching and carrying on discussions with traditional scholars.

Kerala had a pretty long tradition of Sanskrit education and the Gurukula-s were places of deep study in different branches. The study was undertaken here with extreme devotion. Hence Kerala had contributed much to the fields of Śāstras like Vedānta, Vyākaraṇa and Mīmāṃsā. But the entrance of Nyāya in Kerala seems to be much later. There were references to Nyāya scholars in the early works but they were not remembered as Nyāya scholars because there is no written record of their scholarship. They remained satisfied with learning, teaching and participation in the sadas. Receiving awards was considered as great recognition. Thus there was a tradition for the study of Nyāya in Kerala for a long time. But it cannot be definitely said that such tradition continued in Kerala. The traditional paṇḍits are very few and even if one or two are still living, they are aged and are unable to transmit their scholarship to the next generation. Modern education is examination oriented and deep study of the subject is not necessary for a pass in the examination. So the students educated in the modern method do not appreciate the technique SS adopted in NRM and the work became unpopular even among modern scholars in the field of Nyāya.

Now an attempt is made to point out the merits of Nacaratnamālikā. NRM will definitely be appreciated by a traditionally trained Nyāya scholar. Parīkṣit Rāma varma, the renowned Nyāya scholar remarks in the 'Bhūmikā' of NRM that this work is a great lagoon on entering which one can perceive ever so many significant things and enjoy great bliss whereby one's hand becomes automatically folded in respect and admiration to the great author of this unique work[14]. The Kāśi Viśvavidyālaya published NRM with its commentary Nūtanāloka considering the fact that it will be useful for those logicians whose intelligence is interested to play in the high waves of the ocean of Navya Nyāya[15].

The Navya Nyāya system in our country consists of vast mass of literature. The famous text TC itself has numerous commentaries written by renowned scholars. But these commentaries which deal with various topics are not accessible to a common reader due to the technique, in dealing topics. So there arises necessity of sub commentaries which treat topics seperately with suitable explanations. Then only the topics of the original texts become understandable. The Kerala writers in the field of Nyāya Śāstra concentrated their attention to compose sub commentaries. The books so composed from Kerala were small in number and among them the NRM of SS occupies a unique position.

The text is an exhaustive explanation of a simple definition of 'vyāpti'. The explanation is in a unique style. The intention of the author seems, not only to give the explanation of a definition, but also to discuss a number of important topics with the help of Navya Nyāya concepts and theories. The style SS adopted in dealing subjects in long long sentences with the application of the concepts establish his depth of knowledge and vision of ideas to be added to make it perfect. The imaginative power of the author is so high that sometimes the discussions spreads to wider areas by the technique of 'ankurakalapanā'. So it is a collection of a number of ideas of Navya Nyāya in a single text.

The study of the book establishes that SS lived at a time which was the golden age in Kerala for the study of Navya Nyāya. The encouragement he received from the Cochin royal family is worth mention. SS wrote such a book since there were people to read and appreciate the theme and style he adopted in the work. It is also notable that the Navya Nyāya was preferred by the natives of Kerala than Prācīna Nyāya. The works of GBT and PRV also establish this fact.

The commentary on NRM named Nūtanāloka which serves as a new light to see the views contained in the NRM is also composed by the same author. It is another specimen of his deep erudition in Navya-

Nyāya as well as in 'śruti', 'smṛti' etc. This commentary gives the explanations for the topics dealt in NRM. Occasionally the explanation takes deviation to deal with incidental issues. The incidental topics like the capacity of right knowledge to destroy the 'Adṛṣṭa' and that of river Gangā to give emancipation are discussed with many references from Vedas and Purāṇas[16].

The Avatārika and Tippaṇi for Subodhini, the work of Parīkṣit Tampuran were also written by our author. These are examples for SS's deep learning. They establish the respect of our author to his patron Rājarsi Rāma Varman and Parīkṣit Rāma Varman.

The works of Śāstṛ sarman reveal the fact that the author is a good poet as well as a great devotee of Śiva.

The general belief among the Sanskrit scholars is that the harsh intellect of a 'Tārkika' cannot be attracted by the slim beauty of a 'kāvya'. But SS is an exception to this. Study of his two works viz-'Gangātaranginī' and 'Cātakasandeśa' makes it clear that SS was an imaginative and talented poet. Among these GT seems to be a more elegant and matured work in which the poet expresses his deep devotion to Goddess Gangā and Lord Gangādhara. As an ardent devotee SS depicts the greatness

of Gangā which he experienced during his pilgrimage to Kāśi. GT in which all the charecteristic features of a stōtra kāvya are adopted,is a valuable contribution of the poet to stotra literature. The author is well versed in the ancient literature of India viz. Veda, Itihāsa, Purāṇa etc and this is well evident in each and every verse of the poem.

The theories of Advaita Vedānta and Nyāya are also included in suitable places to describe the greatness of Goddess Gangā and Lord Śiva. The poet considers Lord Śiva as 'Parabrahman' and Goddess Gangā as the 'Śakti' of that indescribable Parabrahman[17].

The beautiful verses of the poem disclose the heart of a 'devoted sahṛdaya'. Almost all the verses contain references from Veda, Purāṇa etc and they instigate the devotion of the readers also. The references and stories alluded in the verses are clearly explained in the Ṭīkāprasūnāñjali, the commentary to the GT by our author. Although the commentary does not give the 'anvaya' or 'artha' of the verses, it is of great help to get the inner ideas to those readers who are ignorant of the stories related to Ganga and Gangādhara. The last verse of each chapter is entirely devoted to Gangādhara and these verses are explained elaborately with all the references.

Viswanāthaṣṭaka - an appendix to Gangātaranginī is also composed by the author in praise of Lord Śiva. It consists of eight verses which also are very beautiful.

All the famous alankara-s and vṛtta-s are made used of by the author to make the kāvya attractive. The ardent efforts of the poet has culminated in giving us a collection of references about the greatness of Gangā and Gangādhara deserves special mention.

The 'Cātakasandeśa' a message poem is also considered to be the work of SS. It follows the general style of 'sandeśakāvya' accepted by Kālidāsa in the Meghadūta. It is quite significant in as much as it gives valuable informations about the important places, temples, scholars and kings of that time[18]. The feelings of a seperated lover is clearly delineated in this work by the poet. All these works are examples of the power of description, skill in the effective use of figures of speech and sensous appeal of beauty of our author.

Sāstṛ Śarman entertained great respect to Indian culture and used all his erudition to propogate the same and to find out favourable view points to establish its relevance. As a true Naiyāyika SS could establish the authority of Vedas more effectively and decisively. Nyāya

Śāstra is evolved as a science of discussion (vāda vidyā) to think about the cause and effect relationship between the rituals we perform and effects which it is said to produce[19]. The authority of the vedas is established to a great extent by the science of reasoning called 'Nyāya'. The reasoning required for the establishment of 'Adṛṣṭa' and such other concepts has been dealt with in the Nyāya more comprehensively than in any other systems of Indian philosophy. The Nyāya alone demonstrates that the Veda is authoritative because it was delivered by God who is the reliable speaker (āpta). The Nyāya sūtra actually defends the Vedas from the attacks of those who find in them untruth, contradiction and tautology and declares the sacred text to be infallible like a spell or medical science[20].

It is noteworthy here that the Naiyayikas are generally Śaiva-s as they look upon as their favourite deity Śiva who is the creator and destroyer of the universe. They always worship and meditate on Śiva. Dr. Satīṣchandra vidyābhūṣan the author of the History of Indian Logic remarks that 'whatever might have been the faiths of Akṣapāda and Vātsyāyana, there is no doubt that all the Brāhmaṇic Naiyāyikas from Udyotakara downwards were Śaivas. The work of Udayana, Bhāsarvajña and Gangeśopādhyāya contain abundant proofs to vindicate the fact that

their authors were śaivas by faith[21]. Sāstr̥ śarman also followed the path of these famous Naiyāyikas.

SS always respects the vedic culture and tries to follow the ritual practices. As stated earlier SS was born and brought up in an atmosphere where all the traditional practices of the Nampootiri Brāhmins were followed with extreme devotion. It is said that 'Cātakasandeśa' the message poem of SS was written when he had to observe the 'Deekṣa' for one year on account of the death of his elder brother and thereby got seperated from his beloved[22]. PRV the friend of SS remarks about the author that he devoted his life for two things. One is the learning and teaching of śāstras which is the cause of enjoyment in this world. The other one is the worship of Śiva which is the cause of enjoyment both in this world as well as in the other world[23].

All the works of SS begin and end with salutations to his favourite deity or to the preceptor. NRM though a high standard work in Navya Nyāya, also contains many topics related to the beliefs and customes of Indian society. The topics like 'kāyavyūha' i.e adoption of numerous bodies by a single soul to experience the karmaphala through these bodies simultaneously with a view of attaining salvation as early as possible, Bhūtaveśa i.e the soul of a person entering another's body and

Pāpanāśakatva of 'Gangā' i.e the power of Gangā to destroy the sins of a devotee, are included in the text[24]. The devotion of Śiva is expressed in the last verse of NRM, by which the jewel chain of 'Naca'-s is surrendered to adorn the neck of the Lord with prayers to give happiness to the enlightened readers[25].

The GT and its appendix 'Viswanāthāṣṭaka' contain elements which are fully devotional. It gives a description of the ten types of major sins, the order of worship to Śiva, the ritual practices like five kinds of bath, bearing of 'bhasma' and 'rudrākṣa', 'pradakṣiṇa' and 'bilvapatrārpaṇa'. The importance of these rituals are explained by the author with the help of quotations from puranic texts[26]. The real nature of a devotee is given in the last chapter of GT[27].

In 'Cātakasandeśa', the author asks the Cātaka to start from the Śankaranārāyaṇa temple at Venkitang after saluting the deity. With the feelings of an ardent devotee, he describes all the temples located between Trichur to Harippat. They include Vadakkumnātha Kṣetra at Trissur, Pūrṇatrayīśa temple at Tripunithura, Śrīkṛṣṇa temple at Ambalapuzha and Śiva temple at Vaikom. He also mentiones the importance and peculiarity of the presiding deities of all these temples. In GT and its commentary 'Tīkāprasūnāñjali' the overflow of devotion from the heart of

the author is clearly discernable. The study of these works are sure to induce devotion in the mind of the readers also.

Śāstrśarman undoubtedly occupies a very significant and adorable position among the modern Naiyāyikās of Kerala.

SS is a lucky person who got acquaintance with a number of scholars with deep erudition in Nyāya. Though these scholars were experts in Vādaprasthāna, most of them were reluctant to write anything about Nyāya śastra. 'Śatam Vada, mā likha' (say hundreds, write nothing) was their attitude. In the rough and hard Śāstra there is always the danger of occuring mistakes and hence they are scared of writing. They were satisfied by mere statements. On the contrary SS in addition to giving lectures on hundreds of topics both in the 'sadas' as well as in his discussions with the other scholars and disciples, showed his courage to write on an important topic in the Nyāya śāstra. Moreover our author adopted the method of treatment of krodapatra-ś which is more difficult to follow. Although the subject of the NRM is discussed by previous logicians, the explanations and the way of treatment of the same in the text is entirely different from them. However the author shows respect to the earlier logician and is always conscious to point that his views are not against those of the famous logicians[28].

The multitalented resources which Śāstṛ śarman had obtained by his hard efforts, were applied in NRM to make the treatment perfect and comprehensive. The author is armed with all the weapons to fight against the possible objections that are pointed out by himself. The explanations, pointing objections, solving the defects with the Navya Nyāya techniques etc are actually amazing. Many important topics of the Nyāya system are included in the text as incidental topics. Hence in dealing with those topics of NRM, SS poses himself as a 'Karkaśa Tārkika'.

In the works like GT, SS is a Sahṛdaya with soft feelings and an ardent devotee of Śiva. In the CS he is a seperated lover suffering from the pangs of love. Hence SS may be considered as an astute logician who contributed much to the field of Nyāya as well as to other branches of learning SS establishes the idea that a 'Karkaśa Naiyāyika' can appreciate the beauty of a kāvya and compose good poetry. It is also remarkable that SS succeded to write good poetry because he was an erudite Nyāya scholar. One who had a firm footing in the technique of Navya Nyāya can assimilate any other system and is able to handle any suject with utmost care. In GT the author had used the concepts of the other systems of philosophy effortlessly to make the poem attractive.

SS is a traditional paṇḍit who devoted the whole life to protect

and propogate our culture. The varied facets of this magnifiscent personality may be summed up as follows.

Firstly the author is a scholar who dwelved into the depth of the subjects of Nyāya śāstra and had applied his intellect to the exhaustive analysis of the minutest detail even to the extent of hair splitting type of discussion. SS is a dedicated teacher who considered teaching as a part of learning and made significant contribution to preserve the Nyāya tradition in Kerala. SS is a scholar who maintained the fact that the devine powers had a great influence in everyone's life and that the ritual practices are to be followed by everyone in accordance with their own tradition.

SS had the firm belief that the goal of life is not material. In his devotional poem GT he preaches that 'Saguṇopāsana' is a means to experience the Nirguṇabrahman. At the same time he also advocates love and respect to our social life and systems. SS is the best example that Kerala can point out to highlight a true Naiyāyika, who also contributed much to other branches of learning. Hence **Śāstṛśarman** the **Karkaśa Tārkika** of Kerala will ever be remembered as a **Tārkikatilaka** among the **Sahṛdayas** and a **Sahṛdayatilaka** among the Tarkikas of Kerala.

References:

1. Caturdaśalakṣaṇī. Pragalbhalakṣaṇam. Didhiti - Raghunāthaśiromiṇi, p-281
2. vide. infra p.p. 107-112
3. vide. infra p.p. 111-116
4. vide. infra p.p. 186-192
5. NRM, p-16
6. vide. infra p.p. 137-144
7. NRM, p-16
8. NRM, p-17
9. Bhumika of PRV, p घ
10. Ibid, p - घ
11. Avatārikā to Gaṅgātaraṅginī by Achyuta Potuval, p - III
12. NRM, p-23
13. vide. infra p -164
14. *अहो गम्भीरमिमं ग्रन्थमहाह्रदमवगाह्य परितः प्रहितदृष्टयः किं किं नापश्याम ! कियन्तमानन्दं नानुभवाम, स्मृत्युपनीतानां ग्रन्थकर्तृणामग्रतोऽस्माकं पाणी मुकुलीभावमभजताम्* Bhumika on NRM, p- झ
15. *नव्यन्यायनीरधेरुत्तुङ्गतरङ्गमाणया मनोविनोदकामानां नैयायिकानां नितान्तं काम्य इत्यनया भावनयाऽस्माभिरस्य संस्कृतविश्वविद्यालयप्रकाश्येष्वन्तर्भावस्य सम्यक्त्वं विभाव्य साम्प्रतमयं सम्मुद्रय विदुषां समक्षं सबहुमानमुपह्रियते* - Prastāvikam to NRM by Surati

Nārāyaṇamaṇi Tripāti V.C. Sanskrit University Vāraṇāsi.

16. vide. infra p.p. - 216-219

17. *प्रत्यङ्मुखैस्ते सगुणं स्वरूपं चिराय इण्टेश्वरि चिन्त्यमानम्*
अतर्क्यमेकं निरूपाख्यमद्धा ब्रह्मैव साक्षात्कृतमित्यमानि GT, VIII 1

18. vide. infra p.p. - 233-238

19. vide. infra p.p. - 116-118

20. *मन्त्रायुर्वेदप्रामाण्यवच्च तत्प्रामाण्यम् आप्तप्रामाण्यात्* NS, 2.1.68

21. HIL, p-155

22. CS Uttarabhāga, sl. 70

23. *उभयत्रैव प्रवृत्तिरेषामाचार्याणां दृष्टा, शास्त्राल्पे शिवपूजायञ्च। शास्त्रेण समानमिह विनोदस्थानम्, शिवपूजयातुल्यमिहामुत्र कल्याणकरञ्च न किञ्चनामी प्रतिपद्यन्त* - Bhumika, p - ड

24 vide. infra p.p. - 238 - 246

25. NRM, p 197

26. vide. infra - p.p. 252-256

27. GT, XXIV 15

28. vide. infra p- 201-202

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Works in Sanskrit

Anumāna Pramāṇa	Dr. Bali Ram Shukla, Eastern Book Linkers, Delhi, 1986.
Avayava	Gaṅgeśopādhyāya, with com. - Dīdhiti, Dīdhiti Prakāśa, and the Bhāvadīpikā by N.S. Rāmānuja Tātācārya, Rāṣṭriya Saṃskṛta Vidyāpeetha, Tirupati, 1996.
Bālabodhanam	Rājarṣi Rāmavarman, Ravivarma Saṃskṛta Granthāvalī, ed., Dr. K.G. Paulose, Tripunithura, 1995.
Cātakaśandeśa	Panditarajan Māntitta Śāstṛśarman, ed., Dr. Muralīmādhavan, Trissur, 1992.
Caturdaśalakṣaṇī	Dīdhiti, with com. - Gādādharī, sub com. Krsnam Bhattiya and Nyāya ratna, ed., N. Santanam Aiyer, Adayar Library and Research Centre, Madras, 1986.
Gādādharī	Com. on Dīdhiti, ed., P.T. Kirtyananda Jha & Satkaryaśarma Vangia, Chaukamba Sanskrit Series office, Vārāṇasi, 1970.
Gaṅgātaraṅginī	Māntiṭṭa Śāstṛśarman, ed., Tarakkal Sankarunni Warrier, Rāja Press, Tripunithura, 1956.

Jagadīśa Vyadhikaraṇam — Jagadīśa, with - Dīpika Swami Sri Rama Prapannacarya, Chaukamba Sanskrit Series office, Varanasi, 1957.

Mānameyodaya — Nārāyaṇabhatta & Nārayaṇa Paṇḍita, Satdarśana Prakasana Pratisthānam No.-5, Varanasi, 1978.

Nacaratnamālikā with commentary Nūtanāloka, — Śāstrśarman, Saraswatibhavan Granthamāla, vol. 93, ed., Surati Narayana Mani Tripati, Varanaseeya Samskrta Viswa Vidhyalaya, Varanasi, 1965.

Navya Nyāya Bhāṣā Pradīpa — Mahāmahopādhyaya, Mahesachandra Nyāyaratna.

Nyayabhāṣya — Vātsyana, with Gautamasūtra and com. - Prasannapada, Sudi Prakasan, Varanasi, 1986.

Nyāyamañjari — Jayantabhatta, ed., Gangadhara Śāstri Tailankar, Vol. III, Part-I, 1895.

Nyāya Siddhānta Muktāvali — Viswanadha Pancānana, with com. - Dinakari & Ramarudri, ed., P.T. Harirama Sukla, Chaukamba Samskrta Samstan, Varanasi, 1989.

Nyāya Vārtika Tātparya Tīka — Vācaspatimisra, ed., Rajeswara Śāstri Dravid, Chaukamba Samskrta Samstan, Varanasi, 1989.

Pañcalakṣaṇi Simhavyāghra-lakṣaṇam	Gangeśa, with com.- Dīdhiti & Dīdhiti Prakāśa and Bālabodhini by N.S. Rāmānuja tādācārya, Rāṣṭrīya Samskṛta Vidyāpeeṭha, Tirupati, Series 26, 1991.
Praśasta Pādabhāṣya	Praśastapāda, with com.-Nyāya Kandali, Gangānātha jha Grandhamāla Vol.1. ed., Durgadhara jha, Vāranāsi, 1977.
Śāradā	K. Rāmakṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭ, com. - on Jalavad hṛdaniścayatvavicāra of Parīkṣit Rāmavarman, 1996.
Subodhini	Parīkṣit Rāmavarman, Sri Ravivarma Samskṛta Series, Tripunithura, No.17, 1987.
Sugalārthamālā with Dīpikā	Panditarājan P. Nārayaṇan Nampootiry, Dīpikā D. Damodara Piṣāroṭy, Tripunithura, 1964.
Tarkabhāṣa	Keśavamisra, with the com. - Tattvaprabhodini, ed., Parameśwara Nārāyaṇa Sastṛy, Karnataka, 1995
Tarkasangraha with Dīpikā	Annambhaṭṭa, with com. - Indumati, Chaukamba Sanskrit Series, Varānasi, 1997.
Tattvacintāmaṇi Part II	Gangeśopādhyāya, with com. - Rahasya, Chaukamba Samskṛta Prastān, Delhi, 1990.

Vaiśeṣika Sūtra — Kaṇāda, with com. Upaskāra and Vṛtti with English Translation edn. II, Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, New Delhi, 1975.

Viṣayatāvāda — Harirama Tarkalankara, with introduction, Critically edited Text and English Translation with notes by V.N. Jha., University of Poona, Pune, 1987.

Vyāpti Pancakam Simhavyaghralakṣaṇam Ca — With Madiri, Jāgadīśi and Candrika, ed., Rudradhara Jha, Varanasi, 1957.

II. Modern Works

1. Malayalam

Keraliya Samskrta Sāhitya Caritram — Rājarājavarma, Vadakkumkur, Sahitya Pravartaka Co-operative Society, Vol. IV, V & VI, Trivandrum, 1962.

Kerala Sāhitya Carittram — Parameswara Aiyer, Ulloor, Vol. V, Department of Publications, University of Kerala, Trivandrum, 1990.

Samskṛta Sahitya Caritram — Ed., K. Kunjunni Raja & M.S. Menon, Vol.II, Kerala Sahitya Academy, Trissur, 1991.

2. English

Das Gupta, Surendranath — A History of Indian Philosophy, Vol.I, Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi, 1975.

Guha Dinesh Chandra — Navya Nyāya System of Logic, Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi, 1979.

Ingalls H.H. Daniel — Materials for the study of Navya Nyāya Logic, Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi, 1988.

Jha V.N., Dr. —
1. Contribution of Nyāya System to Indian thought structure, Calicut University, Series - 6, 1994.
2. Relation in Indian Philosophy, Satguru Publications, Delhi, 1992.

John Vattanky Dr. — Gangeśa's Philosophy of God, Adayar Library and Research Centre, Madras, 1984.

Potter Karl H — Encyclopaedia of Indian Philosophies, Vol. II, Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi, 1977.

Prasād Jwala — History of Indian Epistemology, Munsiram Manoharlal, Delhi, 1987.

Mrnalkanti Gangopādhyāya — Indian Logic in its sources, Munsiram Manoharlal, Delhi, 1984.

Raghunāth Gosh — The Justification of inference - A Navya Nyāya approach, Bharatiya Vidya Prakasan, Varanasi, 1990.

Raja Kunjunni, Dr. — The Contribution of Kerala to Sanskrit Literature, University of Madras, 1980.

Sharma Chandradhar — A critical survey of Indian Philosophy, Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi, 1987.

Sāstri, Dharmendra Nath — The Philosophy of Nyāya Vaiśesika and its conflict with Buddhist Dignāga School, Bharatiya Vidya Prakasan, Delhi, 1976.

Tārasankar Bhattacarya — Nature of Vyāpti, Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series, No. LXXII, Calcutta, 1970.

Vidyābhūsan, Satiśchandra — A History of Indian Logic, Motilal Banarsidas, 1971.

III. Articles

Bhatt S.R. — A Prolegomena to Buddhist Epistemology and Logic, University of Calicut, 1991.

Jha V.N. — Navya Nyāya Philosophy, University of Calicut, 1991.

Prahladācar, D. — Concept of Vyāpti in Nyaya Philosophy, Calicut University, 1991.

Ramakrsna Bhatt .V. — Vyāpti Svarūpa Paricaya, Pūrnatrayi - Sri Ravivarma Samskrta Grandhāvali, Journal, Vol. XXV, 1998.

Raman Nambiar C.K. — Tarkaśāstra, Sri Ravivarma Samskrta Granthāvali, Vol.7, 1959.